DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 176 HE 001 404

AUTHOR	Cox, Lanier; Harrell, Lester E.
TITLE	The Impact of Federal Programs on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	243p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$12.25
DESCRIPTORS	*Coordination, Educational Planning, Federal Aid, *Federal Programs, *Federal State Relationship, *Higher Education, *Planning, Program Coordination, State Agencies, State Federal Aid, State Programs

ABSTRACT

This study examines the state administration of each of the following state-coordinated federal programs: the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; Title I, Community Service and Continuing Education Programs, and Title VI, Part A, Equipment for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction, of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and the State Technical Services Act of 1965. The study analyzes the impact of both the state-coordinated and direct federal programs on state planning and coordination. It also determines the opinions of institutional presidents and state officials on extending the concept of state-coordination to other federal programs and on the need for new types of federal programs and the methods for their implementation. Proposals for new programs include: (1) federal support for state and institutional planning; (2) a federal program of general institutional grants; and (3) a federal tax remission program for education. Lists of the participating states, agencies and institutional presidents, and the questionnaires are appended. (AF)

ED037176

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS
ON
STATE PLANNING AND COORDINATION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by
Lanier Cox, Director
and
Lester E. Harrell, Associate Director
Center for Research in Higher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 404

Southern Regional Education Board / 130 Sixth Street, N. W. / Atlanta, Georgia 30313
1969

ED037176

FOREWORD

In the current period of reexamination and reappraisal of federal programs in higher education and of the appropriate relationship of the federal and state governments in the support of higher education, this report of a study of the impact of federal programs on state planning and coordination in this area and of the opinions of state officials and college and university presidents on the future direction of federal programs is timely. The Southern Regional Education Board foresaw the need for such a study in 1967 and initiated and largely financed the study culminating in this publication.

The number of governors and state agencies participating in the study was large enough to be well representative of the viewpoints of the states. Although the sample of institutional presidents was small, it did include institutions from most of the states and it did represent the various types of senior institutions. In analyzing the institutional responses, an especial effort was made to distinguish between the responses of public and private institutions and, where appropriate, between those of institutions with doctoral programs and those of institutions not offering doctoral level work. Furthermore, the responses of both the institutional presidents and the governors and state agencies were analyzed to determine any differences based on the type of state-wide governance or coordination.

The author is sincerely appreciative for the time and effort of those who granted personal interviews or answered the questionnaires. Especially appreciated was the thoroughness with which many of the respondents analyzed and answered the questions.

The author expresses his appreciation for the significant contributions of Dr. Lester Harrell, Associate Director of the Center for Research in Higher Education. Dr. Harrell was responsible for the analysis of the questionnaires directed to the state agencies administering the four state-coordinated federal programs and prepared the initial drafts for the first two chapters. He also read and made valuable suggestions for the revision of Chapter 3.

The author is also indebted to Dr. E. F. Schietinger, Associate Director for Research of the Southern Regional Education Board for his continuing interest and assistance in the study.

Lanier Cox

Austin, Texas
May 29, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD iii

LIST OF TABLES xi

CHAPTER 1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY 1

The Developing Role of the State and Federal Governments 1

The Developing Role of the States in the Planning and Coordination of Higher Education 1
The Developing Role of the Federal Government in Support of Higher Education 3

Objectives of the Study 4

Federal Programs Studied 5

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 6
Higher Education Act of 1965 7
Title I, Community Service and Continuing Education Programs 7
Title VI, Part A, Equipment for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction 8
State Technical Services Act of 1965 8

State Organizations for the Planning and Coordination of Higher Education 9

Functions of Governing and Coordinating Agencies 11

Procedure Used in Developing the Study 16

CHAPTER 2 STATE-COORDINATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS 21

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 24

General Provisions of the Act 24
Agencies Administering the Act 25
Organization of the Agencies Administering the Act 29
Acceptance by the Institutions 29
State Planning Under the Act 30

Page

CHAPTER 2 (Continued)

Coordination Under the Act 31
Inclusion of Title II and III of the Facilities Act Under the Program 32

Financial Assistance For the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction: Higher Education Act of 1965 - Title VI, Part A - Equipment 33

Community Service and Continuing Education Program: Title I - Higher Education Act of 1965 34

Provisions of the Act 34
State Agencies Administering the Act 37
Organization of the Agencies 38
Acceptance by the Institutions 38
Impact on Planning and Coordination 38
General Impact of Community Service Programs 40

State Technical Services Act of 1965 44

Provisions of the Act 44
State Agencies Administering the Act 48
Organization of the Agencies 48
Acceptance by the Institutions 49
Impact on Planning and Coordination 49
Other General or Specific Effects 50

Summary 51

CHAPTER 3 IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS 59

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on the Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies 59

Effect on Organization, Authority or Function 59
Effect on the Influence, Standing and Acceptability of the Statewide Agencies 63
Effect on the Planning and Coordination Responsibilities of the Governing and Coordinating Agencies 64
Impact on Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies of Dispersal of Responsibility for Administration of State-Coordinated Federal Programs 66
Opinions on Consolidation of Administration of All State-Coordinated Federal Programs in Statewide

CHAPTER 3 (Continued)

Governing or Coordinating Agency 68

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on Relationship of Statewide Governing or Coordinating Agency With State Government 71

Summary of Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on the Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies 71

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on the Planning and Coordinating Functions of the States 73

General Impact 73

Summary of the Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on State Planning and Coordination 80

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on Relationship Between Public and Private Institutions 80

Reaction of Institutions to State-Coordination of Federal Programs 82

Reaction of Presidents to Concept of State Coordination for the Four Federal Programs 82

Reaction of the Presidents to the State Plans and Administration of the State-Coordinated Federal Programs 85

Reaction of the Presidents to the State Plans as Providing Equitably for Interests of Public and Private Institutions 88

Summary of Institutional Reactions to State Coordination of the Four Federal Programs 90

Impact of Federal Programs Implemented Directly With Institutions 90

Institutional Preferences for State-Coordination or for Direct Institutional Negotiation in the Implementation of Existing State-Coordinated Federal Programs 96

Reactions of Public and Private Presidents Generally 103

Reactions Based on Type of Coordination and Type of Institution 103

Summary of Presidents' Reactions 105

Reactions to the Expansion of State-Coordinated Programs 107

CHAPTER 3 (Continued)

- Opinions of the Governors 107
- Opinions of State Agencies Administering Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act 107
- Opinions of Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies 109
- Opinions of Presidents 112
- Summary of the Reactions to An Expansion of State-Coordinated Programs 125

CHAPTER 4 PROPOSALS FOR NEW FEDERAL PROGRAMS 129

- Federal Support for State and Institutional Planning 129
  - Reactions of Governing and Coordinating Agencies 129
  - Reactions of the Governors 133
  - Reactions of the Presidents 139
  - Summary 140
- A Federal Program of General Institutional Grants 141
  - Need for Federal General Institutional Support 141
  - Implementation of a Federal General Institutional Support Program 143
  - Summary 149
- A Federal Tax Remission Program for Education 150
  - General Support for a Tax Remission Program for Education 150
  - Tax Remission to the States in Lieu of Other Federal Aid to Education 158
  - Federal Programs in Addition to a Tax Remission Program 158
  - A Tax Remission Program as an Encouragement to State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education 160
  - Effect of a Tax Remission Program on the Autonomy of Non-Public Institutions 161
  - State Constitutional Provisions Affecting the Inclusion of Private Institutions in a Tax Remission Program 163
  - Summary 166

Page

CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 167

The Effect on State Planning and Coordination of Federal Programs Implemented Directly With Institutions 169

The Effect of State-Coordinated Federal Programs 170

Impact on the State Organizational Structure for Higher Education 170
Impact on State Function of Planning and Coordination of Higher Education 171
Impact on Relationships Between Public and Private Institutions 173

Institutional Reactions and Preferences 173

Presidents' Appraisals of the State-Coordinated Programs 173
Institutional Preferences for State Coordination or Direct Implementation of the Existing State-Coordinated Federal Programs 174

Expansion of the Concept of State-Coordination 175

Reactions to Conversion of Certain Existing Direct Programs to State-Coordinated Programs 175
Reactions to Extension of Concept of State-Coordination for Federal Programs Generally 177

Impact of Federal Programs Related to Type of State Coordination 178

Analysis of Presidents' Opinions Regarding Federal Programs Based on Type of Institution 184

Development of Guidelines for Determination of the Method of Implementation for Federal Programs in Higher Education 189

The Viewpoint of State Governing and Coordinating Agencies 189
The Viewpoint of the Presidents 190
Conclusions 191

Appraisal of Reactions to Proposed New Federal Programs 193

Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY 199

APPENDIX 203

LIST OF TABLES

Tables Page

1 Functions of Governing and Coordinating Boards 12

2 Number of Agencies and Persons Included in Sample 17

3 Funds Authorized and Appropriated: Four State-Coordinated Federal Programs 22

4 State Agencies Responsible for Title I - Higher Education Facilities Act and Title VI A - Higher Education Act 26

5 State Agencies or Institutions Responsible for Title I - Community Service and Continuing Education Programs 35

6 State Agencies or Institutions Responsible for the State Technical Services Act 45

7 Central Coordinating Agencies Responsible for State-Coordinated Federal Programs 53

8 Presidents' Opinions on Impact of Federal Programs on State Agencies 61

9 Presidents' Opinions on Consolidation of Federal Programs Administration 70

10 Effect of Administrative Responsibilities on Relationship of Agency to State Government 72

11 Effects of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on State Planning 76

12 Presidents Indicating Some Contribution to State Planning and Coordination 77

13 Effects of Federal Program Administration on Cooperation Between Public and Private Institutions 81

14 Reaction of Public Institutions to Consolidated Federal Programs Administration 83

Tables Page

15 Reaction of Private Institutions to Consolidated Federal Programs Administration 84

16 Satisfaction of Presidents with Approved State Plans for Federal Programs 86

17 Satisfaction of Presidents with Administration of State Plans for Federal Programs 87

18 Equitability of State Plans for Federal Programs for Public and Private Sectors 89

19 Governors' Views of Problems Due to Programs Administered Directly by Institutions 91

20 Difficulties for Agencies Due to Categorical Basis of Federal Programs 92

21 Constraint on Choice of Action of State Agency Due to Previous Grants 93

22 Instances of Grants or Loans Unauthorized by State Agency 94

23 Impact of Public Health Service Act Programs on State Agency Planning 94

24 Coordination Difficulty Due to Level of Federal Support 95

25 Presidents' Views of Own Institutions' Interests Being Served by Coordinated Administration of Federal Programs 97

26 Presidents' Views of All Interests Being Served by Coordinated Administration of Federal Programs 100

27 Agencies' Views on Title II, HEFA, Administration by Title I, HEFA, Agency 108

28 Agencies' Views on Correlation of Administration of Title III - Loans for Construction, With Title I 109

29 Presidents' Views on Administration of Title II, HEFA 113

30 Presidents' Views on Administrative Coordination of Title III, HEFA and Title I 116

Tables Page

31 Presidents' Suggestions on Administration of Other Federal Programs by State Agency 117

32 Percentage Distribution of Presidents on Conversion of Other Programs to State Agency Administration 120

33 Federal Programs that Presidents Want Administered by Individual Institutions 123

34 Agencies' Opinions on Federal Grants for Comprehensive State Planning 130

35 Governors' Opinions of Federal Grants for Comprehensive State Planning 134

36 Presidents' Opinions on Federal Grants for Comprehensive State Planning 136

37 Opinions on Federal Grants for General Institutional Development 145

38 Opinions on Tax Remission to States for Educational Support 155

Chapter 1

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

The Developing Roles of the State and Federal Governments

Since the end of World War II the sharply increasing number of students enrolling in American institutions of higher education, the expanding areas of knowledge and the development of new applications and techniques, the demands of all phases of our society for more highly educated personnel, and the increasing expectations that the resources of our colleges and universities be made available to aid in the identification and solution of our society's pressing problems have not only had a material impact on our institutions of higher education, but also have increased the involvement--and investment--of our state and federal governments in higher education.

The Developing Role of the States in the Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

The major investment in new and expanded educational resources has been made by the states in providing public higher educational opportunities to meet the demands of an increasing percentage of a rapidly rising college-age population. New institutions have been established and existing institutions expanded horizontally by the addition of new programs and new departments and vertically by adding upper division, masters' or doctoral level programs.

At the beginning and during the early years of this period most of the states did not have special, statewide agencies to plan for or to coordinate this expansion. Prior to 1950 only eighteen states had established such organization. Fourteen[1] had statewide governing boards responsible for the governance of all institutions, or all senior institutions, of higher education; two had vested some responsibility for governance or coordination in their state departments of education, and two had established statewide coordinating agencies between the institutions and state government. In other states, governors, legislators and general state governmental agencies merely responded to the individual plans and demands of the institutions. And even in the eighteen states with central agencies, effective long-range planning was slow in developing.

---

[1] In one of these states, Oregon, there is now a coordinating council with overall planning responsibility independent of the statewide governing board for senior institutions and the State Board of Education responsible for the junior colleges.

From 1945 to 1968 not one state chose to abolish existing institutional governing boards and to substitute a statewide governing board for all institutions. In 1968 and 1969, Maine and West Virginia did take this action. With these two exceptions, the choice has been to maintain, or only somewhat rearrange, the existing system of governance and to interpose between the institutions and the regular agencies of state government a special agency charged with some degree of responsibility for the planning and coordination of higher education in the state. From 1957 through 1967, statewide planning and coordinating agencies with varying responsibilities were established in eighteen states, and some responsibility for institutions of higher education was vested in state departments of education in two states. The authority given to these agencies varied from merely advisory responsibilities to responsibilities for budget review, establishment of new programs, establishment of new institutions, etc. Their establishment reflected the desire of governors and legislatures--and some institutions--for a more orderly and planned expansion of higher education. This move toward coordination was supported in some states by many or most of its institutions, accepted reluctantly as an inevitability by institutions in other states, sometimes after failure of voluntary arrangements, and vigorously opposed by some institutions in other states.

The short history of the coordinating agency reveals the uncertain and precarious position of this agency in most states where it has been established. Interposed between the state's general governing agencies and the institutions, the coordinating agency has been subject to pressures from both sides. Institutions have regarded its authority and its exercise of that authority as an encroachment upon institutional autonomy, and state officials who brought about its creation have been reluctant to accept its performance in the role which they established. Unlike the statewide governing agencies which were established and had their relationships developed in a period of relative educational tranquility, the coordinating agencies were created to try to bring order and planning to rather chaotic educational growth and expansion. As a result of all of these pressures an appropriate role for the coordinating agency generally acceptable to the different institutions, agencies and officials affected by its activities has yet to evolve in most states.

The relationship between state government and its colleges and universities has been studied and appraised by a number of knowledgeable researchers, including Moos and Rourke, Chambers, Brumbaugh, Henderson, Glenny, and others.[2] This present study is concerned with this relationship to the extent that it is affected by federal programs providing support for higher education. The nature and extent of the impact of federal aid-to-education programs on state planning and coordination of higher education are analyzed on the basis of the types of state governing and coordinating organizations which represent the states' formalization of this relationship. Opinions of institutional presidents, state governors, and heads of state governing or coordinating agencies and other state agencies concerning the effect of federal programs on state planning and coordination, which are the basis for this study, are influenced by each individual's opinion as to the appropriate relationship between state government and its academic institutions, and by his reaction to, and evaluation of, both the form and the performance of his state's coordinating organization. Recognition and understanding of this fact is essential to the interpretation and evaluation of the findings and conclusions of this study.

The Developing Role of the Federal Government in Support of Higher Education

During the period since the end of World War II, the level of federal support for the nation's institutions of higher education has increased manyfold. Added to the contract research programs of the armed services which reached significant levels during the War and the direct payments to institutions for the education of veterans which provided material support for a few years following the War, have been a multiplicity of federal programs providing direct and indirect support to American higher education. The concept of contract research has been extended to new and different federal agencies. Programs of federal grants to individuals, faculty members and students, and to institutions for academic and non-academic programs, for departmental and academic area development, for workshops and special programs, for equipment, for construction of physical facilities, etc., have been established by Congress in different federal departments and agencies. The federal government has become a major source of credit to higher education, loaning money to institutions for construction of academic and non-academic buildings and facilities and to students to defray their educational expenses.

Much has been written concerning the impact of these and other federal programs on the college or university--on its programs, its faculty, its academic and budgeting integrity, its organization (*e.g.*, the creation of institutes and centers to attract federal funds sometimes to the disadvantage of academic departments), and on its *de facto* autonomy. Orlans, Babbidge and Rosenzweig, Dobbins, Knight, Little, the Carnegie Foundation, and others[3] have identified and evaluated these various influences and their consequences.

---

[2] See bibliography in appendix for specific references.

In 1963, with the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act, Congress for the first time involved the states in the administration of a federal program in aid of higher education. Funds were allocated to the states to be administered by designated state agencies under state plans developed in conformity with general criteria prescribed in the Act and by the Office of Education. This program constituted the first recognition by Congress of the interests and role of the states in determining the utilization of federal funds by the states' institutions of higher education. Other federal programs involving administration and coordination by the states were included in the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Objectives of the Study

With the advent of these new state-coordinated federal programs there has been to some extent a joinder of the interests and objectives of the federal and state governments in the development of higher education. This study is concerned with this new relationship as it relates to the impact of these programs on state planning and coordination of higher education--the function and the organization--in comparison with the impact on the state of federal programs implemented directly between federal agencies and the institutions. Under the state-coordinated federal programs the role and responsibility of the state is enlarged by the inclusion of private institutions as participants in the benefits of the program planned and administered by the state. Appropriate representation of the private sector on the agencies or advisory committees is a prescription of these programs, and recognition by the state of the existing and potential contributions of the private institutions is required in the development of state plans. The implications of this new relationship both for the states and for the private institutions are explored as part of this study.

Not only does the study attempt to assess the impact of existing federal programs, but also it attempts to determine the reactions of institutional presidents and state government officials to further expansion of the concept of state-coordination to programs now implemented between the federal agencies and the institutions. Further, it samples the opinions of presidents, governors, and directors of state governing and coordinating agencies regarding the need and desirability for new types of federal programs.

---

[3] See bibliography in Appendix for specific references.

Specifically, the study

1. Examines the administration by the state of each of four state-coordinated federal programs.
2. Analyzes the impact of both the state-coordinated and direct federal programs on state planning and coordination of higher education.
3. Determines the opinions of institutional presidents and state officials on extending the concept of state-coordination to other federal programs.
4. Determines the opinions of institutional presidents and state officials on the need for new types of federal programs and the methods for their implementation.

Federal Programs Studied

Prior to 1963, federal funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress in direct or indirect aid to higher education were administered by designated federal agencies which distributed them directly to colleges and universities on the basis of criteria and guidelines contained in the Congressional Acts and developed by the responsible agencies. Some of the programs were designed to accomplish national objectives through utilization of the expertise of faculty members wherever they might be located. Contracts negotiated by the branches of the armed service and the Department of Defense are examples of these programs. Other programs administered by the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, etc., had as their purpose either the primary objective of upgrading educational programs in the broad national interest or the joint objective of furthering specific national programs by providing support to enhance the quality of institutions having the potential to contribute materially to these specific purposes.

With the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Congress provided in Title I of the Act a new approach to federal aid to education which delegated to the states much of the administration, planning and decision-making involved in the implementation of the program. In enacting Title I, Undergraduate Facilities, Congress recognized the interests of the states in the development of higher education within their respective jurisdictions and provided each state with the opportunity and responsibility to coordinate and supervise the implementation of the program within the state. This title of the Act was an implicit recognition of the widespread moves toward coordination of higher education in many states and a response to the demands of state governors that the states be given an appropriate role in the enhancement of higher education through federal support.

This new concept of state coordination of federal programs was extended by Congress in the Higher Education Act of 1965, in Title I, providing community service and continuing education programs; Title IV B, establishing an insured student loan program; and Title VI A, providing grants for equipment for undergraduate instruction. Congress, in the same year, also passed the State Technical Services Act which was designed to aid business and industry through state programs involving educational institutions in the dissemination of technical information. All of these programs are administered for the federal government by the Office of Education except the State Technical Services Act which is under the Department of Commerce. In general each of the programs involves the allotment of funds to each of the states to be administered under state plans by a designated state agency subject to certain federal criteria and to final review and approval by the federal agency.

The purpose of this study is to appraise the impact of federal programs in aid of higher education--both those implemented directly with the institutions and those administered and coordinated by the states--on the planning and coordinating function of the states in higher education. The state-coordinated federal programs considered in this appraisal are briefly described below and are covered in detail in Chapter 2.

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

Title I, Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities

This program authorizes the allocation of appropriated funds to the states for the purpose of grants to institutions of higher education for financing the construction of undergraduate academic facilities. A provision in the original Act limiting funds to the construction of facilities for the natural and physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, engineering and libraries was deleted by Congress in the 1965 Amendment to the Act. Funds allocated to each state are divided between community colleges and technical institutes (Sec. 103) and senior institutions (Sec. 104). Prior to fiscal 1968 twenty-two percent of each state's total was allocated to Section 103 institutions; in 1968 this allocation was twenty-three percent, and will increase to twenty-four percent for fiscal 1969. The federal share of construction costs for Section 103 institutions is forty percent and for Section 104 institutions is not more than one-third of the total cost. If funds allocated to either of these categories of institutions in a state are nor used in any fiscal year, the unused funds may be reallocated by the states to the other category of institutions.

Each state is required to designate or establish a central state agency to administer the program and to develop a state plan for determining the priority of institutional projects. The state agency must be broadly representative of both the public and private institutions of higher education. The state plan must provide objective standards to determine relative priorities of eligible projects and the federal share of projects of Section 104 institutions, and must include procedures for administering the program (e.g., closing dates, procedures for hearings, etc.). In developing the state plan, the state agency must comply both with the provisions of the Act and with criteria prescribed by the U. S. Commissioner of Education. The Act, however, provides that the basic criteria developed by the Commissioner must leave adequate flexibility to the states to meet their needs and must "give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity." The Commissioner has final responsibility for determining that projects are eligible under the provisions of the Act.

The costs of administration of the program by the states are covered by the Act. In addition, Congress amended the Act in 1966 to provide funds to support "comprehensive planning to determine the construction needs of institutions of higher education." Liberal administrative interpretation of this provision by the Office of Education has encouraged and supported broad state planning.

Higher Education Act of 1965

Title I, Community Service and Continuing Education Programs

The purpose of the program is to assist in the solution of community problems by strengthening the community service programs of colleges and universities. These programs are defined as any "educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems . . . ."

This title authorizes the allocation of appropriated federal funds to the states to be used in accordance with their state plans to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs among the states' institutions of higher education. Each state must designate an agency which is broadly representative of the institutions of higher education to administer the program and to formulate a state plan setting forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service programs. This title of the Act provides for federal support of such programs to the extent of seventy-five percent in fiscal 1966 and 1967, and fifty percent thereafter. Each state is permitted to use up to five percent of its allotment, or $25,000, whichever is greater, for the administration of the program.

Title VI, Part A, Equipment for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction

The general purpose of this program is to improve undergraduate instruction by providing grants to institutions for acquiring laboratory and other special equipment and for closed circuit television. The federal share is fifty percent of the total cost except where an institution can prove insufficient resources and then the grant may cover up to eighty percent of the cost. Allocations to the states are authorized to be made on a prescribed formula basis.

To participate, a state must designate or establish a state agency which is broadly representative of the public and the institutions of higher education in the state to administer the program and formulate a state plan. Included in the state plan must be objective standards and methods for determining institutional priorities and procedures for administering the program. The U. S. Commissioner of Education must approve the states' plans and determine that projects are eligible.

State Technical Services Act of 1965

The purpose of this Act is "to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting state and interstate programs to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise." The U. S. Department of Commerce is designated to administer the Act at the federal level and the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to allocate appropriated federal funds to the states to be administered by a state institution or agency designated by the governor.

The designated state institution or agency is responsible for developing a five-year plan and an annual technical services program. The five-year plan must outline the technological and economic conditions of the state and identify the major regional and industrial problems, identify the approaches and methods to be used in the solution of these problems and the means for evaluating the effectiveness of these programs, and explain the methods to be used in administering and coordinating the technical services program. Each annual technical services program must identify specific methods for accomplishing particular goals related to the five-year plans, contain a detailed budget and audit procedures, and indicate the specific responsibilities assigned to each participating institution. Each designated state agency is required to appoint an advisory council whose members represent broad community interests to review the state plans. The Secretary of Commerce must finally approve all state plans.

Institutions qualified to implement the technical services programs are institutions of higher education with accredited programs in service, engineering or business administration; a state agency; or a private, non-profit institution meeting criteria established by the Secretary of Commerce.

Federal funds for support of technical service programs are made available on an equal matching basis and the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to pay to each state up to $25,000 for administrative costs.

State Organizations for the Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

The nature and extent of the effect of federal programs on statewide planning and coordination of higher education depend to some degree on the type of agency, its responsiblities, and the acceptance and status of the agency from the viewpoint of both the institutions and the general agencies and offices of state government.

The statewide agencies responsible in some manner for the governance, planning or coordination of higher education in most of the states have been variously classified or categorized. Lyman Glenny[4] and Emogene Pliner[5] use three categories:

1. Governing agency: coordinates and governs all public institutions.
   The word "all" provides some difficulty in applying this definition. In several states, the statewide governing board is responsible for the public junior colleges, but in several other states it is not. Both types of states are classified as "governing board" states.

2. Coordinating agency: coordinates and controls selected activities of public institutions, but restrained from exercising general governing or administrative powers--a board which is superimposed above the governing boards of individual institutions or groups of institutions.

3. Voluntary agency: informal arrangements with no legal status.

---

[4] Glenny, Lyman A., "State Systems and Plans for Higher Education," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, ed. Logan Wilson (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965), pp. 86-103.

[5] Coordination and Planning (Louisiana Higher Education: 3; Baton Rouge, La.: Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc., 1966), pp. 12-18.

Robert Berdahl, who is currently making a study of coordination in selected states for the American Council on Education, will include a fourth category, the state board of education with some legal authority to supervise, plan or coordinate the institutions of higher education. Michigan and Pennsylvania clearly fall within this category because divisions within their State Boards of Education have been given coordinating responsibilities. For the purposes of this study New York and New Jersey are also classified as "State Board of Education" states. In New Jersey, at the time this survey was made, the State Board of Education was not only responsible for the governance of a number of the state colleges but also was responsible for general supervision of all public institutions of higher education, including Rutgers, The State University, which has its own Board of Governors. Because of the overall authority of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York and the fact that it heads the State Education Department, this state is also classified in this fourth category.

For the purposes of this study and on the basis of the facts existing in mid-1967, the states are classified in the following categories:

A. Voluntary Arrangements--1

Indiana

B. States With Governing or Coordinating Agencies--38

1. Governing Boards--13

Alaska
Arizona
Florida
Georgia
Idaho
Iowa
Kansas
Mississippi
Montana
Nevada
North Dakota
Rhode Island
South Dakota

2. Coordinating Agencies--21

Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Illinois
Kentucky
Maryland*
Massachusetts
Minnesota
Missouri
New Hampshire*
New Mexico
North Carolina
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon*
South Carolina*
Texas
Utah
Virginia
Wisconsin

*See explanation in following text.

3. State Boards of Education**--4

- Michigan
- New Jersey
- New York
- Pennsylvania

C. States Without Formal Coordination--11

- Alabama
- Delaware
- Hawaii
- Louisiana*
- Maine
- Nebraska
- Tennessee*
- Vermont
- Washington
- West Virginia
- Wyoming

*See explanation in following text.
**See explanations in text preceding this listing.

The authority granted to coordinating agencies varies from extensive control regarding new institutions, approval of new departments, approval of new academic programs, phasing out of existing academic programs, review of budget requests, etc., to advisory responsibilities only. Maryland and New Hampshire are in this latter category; they are classified as "coordinating" because their state agencies have legal status and the directors of these agencies indicated this classification to be applicable. Oregon is classified as a coordinating agency state because its Coordinating Council has been given legal recognition and has been assigned administrative responsibility for three of the state-coordinated federal programs. The Oregon Coordinating Council has also been assigned general planning responsibility for all higher education, including the senior institutions which are all under the Board of Higher Education and the community colleges which are under the State Department of Education. At the time this survey was made, South Carolina had just created a new Commission on Higher Education. Although this new commission had not been organized, it replaced another coordinating body which had been largely non-operative.

Tennessee, Louisiana and Maine are classified as not having any formal coordinating organizations. Since the date of the survey, Tennessee has created and organized a coordinating agency and Louisiana has authorized such an agency, and Maine has established a statewide governing board. Similar changes may have occurred in other states, but this study should be interpreted on the basis of the effective organizational structures existent prior to 1968.

Functions of Governing and Coordinating Agencies

Since this study is concerned with the effect of federal programs on coordination and planning, the responsibilities and functions of state governing and coordinating agencies need to be reviewed in some detail. A

Table 1

FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING AND COORDINATING BOARDS

Functions	Number of States with Function Governing[a] Boards	Number of States with Function Coordinating[b] Boards
A. Planning and Construction		
1. Adopt Master Plan	12	14
2. Develop Criteria for Establishing New Institutions	9	12
3. Approve Establishment of New Institutions or Campuses	10	12
4. Approve Construction of New Buildings	13	11
B. Budgeting and Finance		
1. Institutional Operating Budget		
a. Review Institutions' Requests	12	15
b. Recommend to Governor	10	13
c. Recommend to Legislature	13	12

[a] Thirteen governing boards are included in Pliner's study.

[b] Nineteen coordinating boards are included. Missing are states which have established coordinating boards after the completion of Pliner's study.

Note: The summary of functions does not include the many qualifications and modifications found in each state and included by Pliner. Many of the qualifications footnoted in Pliner's study relating to the functions of coordinating boards indicate that board authority with respect to a function is limited to recommendation.

Table 1 (Continued)

Functions	Number of States with Function Governing[a] Boards	 Coordinating[b] Boards
d. Use Formula as Basis for Institutions' Requests	7	9
e. Allocate Funds to Institutions	8	5
2. Capital Budget		
a. Review Institutions and Requests	12	15
b. Recommend to Governor and/or Legislature	13	12
C. Programs, Courses and Divisions		
1. Approve New Programs		
a. Undergraduate	12	15
b. Graduate	13	16
c. Professional	13	16
2. Eliminate Degree Programs		
a. Undergraduate	11	9
b. Graduate	11	9
c. Professional	11	9
3. Courses or Fields of Study		
a. Approve	11	9
b. Discontinue	9	8
4. Approve New Research Programs	12	5
5. Approve New Public Service Programs	13	7
6. Approve New Division Within Institution	13	8

Table 1 (Continued)

Functions	Number of States with Function Governing[a] Boards	Coordinating[b] Boards
D. Student Policy		
1. Establish Student Admission Policies	12	7
2. Establish Student Charges	12	7
3. Establish Probational and/or Suspension Policies	8	2
4. Establish Student Inter-Institutional Transfer Policies	9	5
E. Faculty Policy		
1. Establish Salary Schedules	10	3
2. Establish Promotion Policy	7	1
3. Establish Tenure Policy	12	1
4. Approve New Appointments	11	1

good source for an inventory of these functions is Pliner's study.[6] She derived her list by obtaining from the various state boards and agencies a list of their official responsibilities and then asking a representative of each agency to check that part of her manuscript describing the responsibilities of his agency. The total list of functions and the functions of each state agency are, therefore, those reported by the states. The information in Table 1 is an adaptation of categories used by Pliner in several of her tables.

The classification of the state agencies in the table as either governing or coordinating boards follows Pliner's classification based on 1965 data. These classifications are not necessarily the same as the classifications used in this study, but are used to show the entire expanse of such functions and their general distribution between these specified types of agencies.

In only a few instances did agencies report having all the responsibilities listed, and these were central governing boards. No coordinating agency reported having all the functions listed in Table 1. The functions most frequently found are in the categories, "Approve New Graduate Programs" and "Approve New Professional Programs." Other functions frequently reported pertain to budget review. The inclusion of the master planning responsibility in the "Planning and Construction" category relates this function too closely to the development of physical plant. Since master planning applies generally to all areas, a separate category would have been more appropriate.

Although the function of statewide, long-range planning for higher education is not new, the extent to which states are becoming involved in this activity has greatly increased in recent years. Glenny found planning to be poorly developed in his study of coordination conducted in the middle fifties.[7] Since that time California, New York, Ohio, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Oregon and others have adopted statewide master plans. Glenny found several reasons for poor planning. Agencies often did not know what planning was or how to do it, or they may not have undertaken planning for fear of being accused of interfering with institutional affairs. Some agencies had inadequate staffs. Planning was overlooked by some agencies because coordination was conducted by negotiation rather than by long-range planning. In some states the private institutions objected to statewide planning by the public coordinating agency. A final reason found by Glenny was disinterest on the part of some staffs.

---

[6] Coordination and Planning (Louisiana Higher Education: 3; Baton Rouge, La.: Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, 1966), pp. 39-50.

[7] Glenny, Lyman A., Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

A comparison of the list of functions in Table 1 with the provisions for state level administration and planning in the federal acts under study reveals the areas of responsibility of the state agencies subject to the influence of federal programs. The subsequent chapters of this study will examine in some detail the effect of both direct and state-coordinated federal programs on both the planning functions and the coordinating functions of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies.

Procedure Used in Developing the Study

To assess the impact of federal programs in higher education on state planning and coordination of higher education, information and opinions were sought from both academic institutions and agencies and offices of state government. Specifically, selected colleges and university presidents in all fifty states and all governors, administrative heads of statewide governing and coordinating agencies, and directors of state agencies (or institutions) designated to administer the state-coordinated federal programs under study were either interviewed or asked to complete questionnaires. Discussions were also held with staff members from the United States Office of Education and the Department of Commerce responsible for the federal programs included in this study. Four or more institutional presidents in each state having as many as four institutions were asked to participate. In all, two hundred and ten presidents were either interviewed or sent questionnaires. Included in this sample were the state universities and other types of state-supported institutions selected from the public sector and randomly selected private institutions, Protestant-related, Catholic-related and independent. Some junior college presidents were interviewed and others were sent questionnaires, but because the number responding was too small to be meaningful, responses from junior college presidents were not included in the study.

Because the opinions of the participants were sought on a confidential basis under a commitment of anonymity, a careful attempt has been made not to make any identification or association which would relate any opinion or comment to a specific respondent. However, lists of the agencies and persons responding in sufficient detail to be included in the study are in the Appendix. Without the generous contribution of time and effort by all of those listed, this study would not have been possible.

A summary of the number of agencies and individuals asked to participate and the number responding by questionnaire or in personal interviews is given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

NUMBERS OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE

Category	Number Responding	Number Asked To Respond
Statewide Governing or Coordinating Agencies	32	38
Governing Boards	(9)	(13)
Coordinating Agencies	(20)	(21)
State Boards of Education	(3)	(4)
Higher Education Facilities Agencies (Title I - HEFA and Title VI A HEA)	47	50
Community Service and Continuing Education Agencies	37	49[a]
State Technical Services Agencies	32	49[a]
College and University Presidents	146	210
Governors	36	50

[a] At the time of the survey Indiana had not implemented these programs.

Interviews in eleven states (California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, and Texas) were conducted in the summer of 1967 and the questionnaires were mailed in October, 1967. Completed questionnaires were received as late as May of 1968. The eleven states (six in the Southern Region and five others) selected in which to conduct interviews were chosen on the basis of the type of state coordination and the manner in which the federal programs were administered.

Illinois, Ohio and Texas have strong coordinating agencies which, with the exception of the State Technical Services Act in Illinois, administer all of the state-coordinated federal programs under review. California and Maryland have advisory type coordinating agencies, with the Coordinating Council in California having somewhat more authority than the Maryland Advisory Council of Higher Education. Also, the California

Coordinating Council administers the undergraduate facilities program, but the Advisory Council in Maryland does not have responsibility for any of the federal programs. North Carolina and South Carolina also have coordinating agencies; in South Carolina a new agency had at the time of the survey just been created to replace a previous non-functioning agency. The Commission on Higher Education in South Carolina had not been designated to administer any of the federal programs under study and the Board of Higher Education in North Carolina administered only the Community Service and Continuing Education Program.

Florida and Oregon were selected as representative of states with statewide governing boards, but on the basis of information developed in the survey Oregon was reclassified as a coordinating agency state. The Board of Higher Education governs all state-supported senior institutions in Oregon and the State Department of Education is responsible for the State's junior colleges. But as a result of the state-coordinated federal programs, the informal Governor's Coordinating Council was given formal status and was assigned administrative responsibility for all but the State Technical Services Act. The Coordinating Council now had operating responsibilities as well as advisory authority, including the responsibility for state planning for higher education. Its authority and responsibilities now approximate those of the Coordinating Council of California.

Neither Louisiana nor Indiana has any formal statewide coordination, although in Louisiana all of the state colleges are under the State Board of Education and in Indiana, by a voluntary arrangement of the presidents of the four senior state-supported institutions, there is de facto coordination concerned primarily with budget requests to the Legislature.

The project director was successful in securing interviews with four governors, all of the executive officers of the statewide governing or coordinating agencies, the directors of most of the state agencies (or institutions) administering the state-coordinated federal programs, and numerous public and private institution presidents in the eleven states. The interviews were semi-structured in form. Prior to these interviews, sets of questions had been developed for each of the groups interviewed and these questions were followed as closely as the duration and circumstances of the interviews permitted. On the basis of this interviewing experience, the six questionnaires listed below were constructed. These questionnaires are reproduced in the Appendix.

Questionnaire	To Be Answered By
A	Governing or Coordinating Body in States Having Statutory or Voluntary Coordinating Boards or Agencies
B	Governors of the States

C	College and University Presidents
D	Agencies and Institutions designated to Administer the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963--Title I - Undergraduate Facilities, and Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI A-Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction Equipment
E	Agencies and Institutions Designated to Administer the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title I - Community Service and Continuing Education Programs
F	Agencies and Institutions Designated to Administer the State Technical Services Act of 1965

In a number of instances in which the interviews did not provide a complete coverage of the material in the questionnaires, the participants were sent questionnaires and asked to answer only the specific questions necessary to provide a complete response. This follow-up procedure was successful in providing full responses in most instances.

As anticipated, in the completion of the questionnaires more success was had in obtaining specific answers than in securing the rationale for, or an explanation of, these answers. Nevertheless, on most of the important points a sufficient number of the answers did provide this additional dimension to make it possible to gain an insight to the issues and differing viewpoints which motivated the specific answers.

The results of the interviews and the completed questionnaires were analyzed and compared. All responses were analyzed on the basis of the type of state coordination, and in addition the responses of the presidents were analyzed as to type of institution (public or private) and, where meaningful, on the basis of institutions with and without doctoral programs.

The analyses of Questionnaires D, E, and F (see above tabulation) were the basis for developing Chapter 2 which examines separately each of the state-coordinated programs under study. Chapter 3, which evaluates the impact of both institution-oriented and state-coordinated federal programs on state planning and coordination of higher education, and Chapter 4, which samples reaction to three proposed new federal programs, were based primarily on analyses of Questionnaires A, B, and C, with certain references to information provided by the other three questionnaires.

To secure full and frank responses and opinions, all participants in the study were promised complete anonymity and this promise has been scrupulously observed.

Chapter 2

STATE-COORDINATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Federal programs having special significance for statewide coordination and planning are those requiring states to establish or designate a central state agency to administer the programs and to prepare a state plan giving the policies and procedures for distributing federal grants among the various institutions of higher education in the state. Presently there are four of these programs: Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 providing grants for undergraduate academic facilities; two titles of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title I authorizing grants for community service and continuing education programs, and Title VI, Part A providing grants for equipment to improve undergraduate instruction; and the State Technical Services Act of 1965. Each of these federal programs, since they call for state coordination, has had and will continue to have varying degrees of influence on the attempts of states to coordinate and plan for the development of higher education. To be considered is the extent to which the four programs have initiated or affected state efforts at planning and coordination in states which did not have formal state agencies with these responsibilities at the time the programs were established, and the extent to which the responsibilities under these programs have been related to the planning and coordinating functions in states having central agencies charged with these responsibilities for higher education.

Of the four state-coordinated federal programs, Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act is most important for its effect on state coordination and planning. It was the first act to be passed requiring the designation of a central agency and the formulation of a state plan. Its passage in 1963 and its implementation in 1964 means that states, at the time information for the present study was collected, had had about three years of experience with this program as compared to the two years, or less, of experience with the other three programs. Also, the Facilities Act has been funded at a level far above the other three programs, which has made possible more aid to more institutions with a consequent greater sphere of influence for the state agency. (See Table 3 for comparisons of funding levels for the four programs.) A further reason for the relatively greater importance of the Facilities Act is that in about half of the states new agencies were established especially to administer this program, while for the other three programs agencies already in existence generally were assigned the responsibility for their administration.

The Higher Education Facilities Act and the two titles of the Higher Education Act considered here are the responsibility of the Office of

Table 3

FUNDS AUTHORIZED AND APPROPRIATED FOUR STATE-COORDINATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Program		Dollars Authorized	Dollars Appropriated
Undergraduate Facilities Program - Title I - HEFA			
	1965	$230,000,000	$230,000,000
	1966	460,000,000[a]	457,000,000
	1967	460,000,000	453,000,000
	1968	728,000,000	267,000,000
Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction - Title IV A - HEA			
	1966	37,500,000	15,000,000
	1967	60,000,000	14,500,000
	1968	70,000,000	14,500,000
Community Service and Continuing Education Program - Title I - HEA			
	1966	25,000,000	10,000,000
	1967	50,000,000	10,000,000
	1968	50,000,000	10,000,000

[a] The $230,000,000 authorized for 1965 was added to the 1966 authorization of $230,000,000.

Table 3 (Continued)

Program	Dollars Authorized	Dollars Appropriated
State Technical Services Act		
1966	$ 10,000,000	$ 3,500,000
1967	20,000,000	5,500,000
1968	30,000,000	6,500,000

Education whereas the State Technical Services Act is under the supervision of the Department of Commerce.

In the following sections each of the four federal programs is separately examined. Information and opinions provided by the various state agencies administering the programs are the basis for an analysis of the organizational structure and relationships of these state agencies and for an assessment of the effect of their activities both within the program area and generally on state planning and coordination of higher education.

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

General Provisions of the Act

As given in the Act, its purpose is "to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in funding the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions." Assistance is provided through three titles: Title I - Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities; Title II - Grants for Construction of Graduate Academic Facilities; and Title III - Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities. Titles II and III are not administered at the state level; colleges and universities submit requests for grants authorized by these two titles directly to the U. S. Office of Education. Although some inquiries were made concerning Titles II and III, the focus here is upon Title I and its influence on a state's coordination and planning efforts.

Title I must be administered by a central state agency which is representative of all institutions of higher education within the state. This includes private institutions which are not usually the responsibility of the state or subject to the authority of the state's governing or coordinating agency.

A major responsibility of the agency designated to administer the Facilities Act is the preparation of a state plan to coordinate the distribution of grants among the public and private senior and junior colleges within the limits prescribed by the Act and by the Office of Education guidelines. The state plan must give the various criteria, and the proportionate weight assigned to each, to be applied to project proposals to determine a comparable total point value for each. Priorities of institutional projects then are determined by ranking the point totals of the various projects. The central state agency in determining and weighting the criteria operates within the limitations imposed by the Act and the federal agency but does have enough flexibility to reflect state policy to some extent in meeting special state needs. To the extent, therefore, that planning and coordination of higher education institutions and programs are affected by facilities programs, Title I affords both the state and the federal government a role in these functions.

State Agencies Administering the Act

The type of state agency designated or created in the various states is of special interest here, because it is through and on these agencies that the impact of the federal programs on the states' planning and coordination function in higher education is felt. States have complied with the requirement to establish a representative state agency in various ways. Many created new boards to be sure that the "broadly representative" provision to provide proper representation for private as well as public institutions was met. Others designated existing boards and appointed advisory committees to give the board the necessary broad representation. A third group assumed that existing boards within the structure of the state government were representative.

In the present study, state agencies administering Title I of the Facilities Act are divided into five categories:

1. Governing boards
2. Coordinating boards
3. State boards of education
4. Specially created facilities boards
5. Other state agencies

The type of agency responsible for Title I of the Facilities Act in each state is shown in Table 4.

Several observations can be made about these state agencies administering Title I. Slightly more than half of the states chose to create a special or separate agency to administer the program. Since in twelve of these states there were no formal governing or coordinating agencies for higher education, the creation of a central facilities agency has provided the possible medium through which some coordination of higher education can occur.

The total number of formally established central coordinating agencies (see page 10) in the United States at the time of this survey was thirty-eight. Administration of the Facilities Act has been assigned to sixteen of these central agencies. In the remaining thirty-four states there exists the problem of correlating the planning and coordinating functions of the general coordinating agencies with the planning and coordinating responsibilities of the separate agencies administering the

Table 4

STATE AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR TITLE I - HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT AND TITLE VI A - HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

State	Name of Agency	Categories				
		1	2	3	4	5
Alabama	State Board of Education			X		
Alaska	Alaska Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Arizona	Arizona State Commission for Higher Education[a]	X				
Arkansas	Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance		X			
California	Coordinating Council for Higher Education		X			
Colorado	Colorado Commission on Higher Education		X			
Connecticut	Commission on Aid to Higher Education				X	
Delaware	Higher Educational Aid Advisory Commission				X	
Florida	State Department of Education			X		
Georgia	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Hawaii	State Commission on Higher Education Facilities				X	
Idaho	State Commission for Higher Education[a]	X				
Illinois	Board of Higher Education		X			
Indiana	Indiana Advisory Commission on Academic Facilities				X	

[a] Same as Board of Regents.

Note: Categories of Agencies

1. Governing board
2. Coordinating board
3. Board of education
4. Specially created facilities board
5. Other state agencies.

Table 4 (Continued)

State	Name of Agency	Categories				
		1	2	3	4	5
Iowa	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Kansas	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Kentucky	Commission on Higher Education				X	
Louisiana	State Commission for the Higher Education Facilities Act				X	
Maine	State Board of Education			X		
Maryland	Board of Public Works					X
Massachusetts	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Michigan	Higher Education Facilities Commission					
	Bureau of Higher Education State Department of Education			X		
Minnesota	Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission		X			
Mississippi	State Building Commission					X
Missouri	Commission on Higher Education		X			
Montana	Commission on Higher Education Facilities Act				X	
Nebraska	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Nevada	Board of Regents	X				
New Hampshire	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
New Jersey	State Commission for the Higher Education Facilities Act				X	
New Mexico	Board of Educational Finance		X			
New York	Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York			X		
North Carolina	Commission on Higher Education Facilities				X	
North Dakota	North Dakota Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Ohio	Board of Regents		X			
Oklahoma	State Regents for Higher Education		X			
Oregon	The Educational Coordinating Council		X			
Pennsylvania	State Commission on Academic Facilities				X	
Rhode Island	Commission for Higher Education Facilities				X	
South Carolina	Commission on Higher Education Facilities				X	

Table 4 (Continued)

State	Name of Agency	Categories				
		1	2	3	4	5
South Dakota	Commission on Higher Education Facilities				X	
Tennessee	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
Texas	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System		X			
Utah	State Building Board					X
Vermont	Commission on Higher Education Facilities				X	
Virginia	Commission on Higher Education Facilities				X	
Washington	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X	
West Virginia	Commission on Higher Education				X	
Wisconsin	Commission for Higher Educational Aids				X	
Wyoming	State Board of Education			X		
Totals		3	11	6	27	3

Facilities Act. In four of the thirty-eight states--Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Oregon--the present form of the central coordinating agency has been established since the Facilities Act was passed, but in only one, Oregon, has the administration of the Act been assigned to the coordinating agency. A coordinating agency was established in Tennessee, and one has been authorized in Louisiana after the data for this study was obtained.

Organization of the Agencies Administering the Act

The staffs of agencies administering Title I are small, with all but three agencies employing less than four administrative and four clerical persons assigned to the administration of the Act. The typical staff includes only one or two of each of these types of personnel. The consensus is that the staff size has been adequate to carry out the responsibilities required by Title I. With staffs so small it is not unusual to find almost unanimous agreement that administrative and planning funds appropriated by Congress have been adequate. Only four states report that administrative funds have been inadequate to support fully the staff and other administrative costs.

The Facilities Act stipulates that the agencies should be broadly representative of the institutions and of the public. To be representative of the private institutions, states appointed either a new agency or an advisory committee to advise an existing state agency. In states where a special agency was established, an advisory committee was not as likely to be appointed as in states where an existing agency was designated. Only forty percent of the states creating a special facilities agency have appointed advisory committees compared to ninety percent of the states which have done so where existing state agencies were designated to administer the Act.

Acceptance by the Institutions

If coordination and planning of the facilities program is to be effective, institutions, both public and private, within the state must be generally receptive to the program and to its administration. Facilities agencies report that public institutions have reacted favorably to the state plan and to the manner in which the program has been administered. Partial evidence of this is the fact that only three such institutions have made a formal appeal from decisions of the agencies, although twenty-two public institutions have voiced objections to criteria and to weights given the criteria. In view of the number of eligible institutions in the United States and the number which have submitted projects, the number of institutions voicing objections is small indeed.

In states where there was already a coordinating board of some type, public institutions had perhaps become accustomed to a certain degree of coordination and planning in a central office. Although this was not the situation with the private colleges and universities, agencies administering Title I nevertheless report that these institutions have generally approved the administration of the facilities program. Only two private institutions were reported to have formally appealed decisions of the state agencies, but sixteen private institutions have objected informally to the criteria or to the weights given criteria by the central agency. Perhaps one reason for the favorable response of private institutions is that in slightly more than half of the states an organization of private institutions was available to which the facilities agency could turn for consultation or negotiation. Eleven state agencies report having used these organizations to good advantage. This report of general satisfaction of the institutions, both public and private, as indicated by the facilities agencies, is supported by the facilities staff in the U. S. Office of Education.

State Planning Under the Act

An important function of coordinating agencies is long-range planning. Since the Facilities Act requires that each state formulate a state plan and provides money for long-range planning, opinions were sought as to the effect this program has had upon this important function. Before 1965 funds for planning were available only from funds provided for the administration of the state agency or from sources other than funds appropriated for the Facilities Act. Amendments in 1965 provided an additional four million dollars for "comprehensive planning to determine the construction needs of institutions of higher education." The regulations released by the U. S. Office of Education interpret the purpose of comprehensive planning liberally, thus allowing planning activities and studies to be related to determining construction needs in rather general ways. At the time states were contacted, i.e., summer and fall of 1967, forty-six had applied for planning grants and one intended to apply. The Facilities Office in the Office of Education reports that by the spring of 1968 all states had applied and that most states had received funds for this purpose. Forty-one of the forty-five facilities agencies providing information indicate that the planning supported by these grants has been correlated in various ways with other planning activities for higher education.

If planning support in connection with the Facilities Act is continued and is interpreted as including broad aspects of higher education, the state facilities agency's function as a coordinating force will be enhanced considerably. Fourteen of the sixteen general coordinating agencies administering the Facilities Act report that their responsibilities under the Act have had a favorable impact on their state responsibility for master planning, with seven indicating that they have been materially aided.

Although twenty, or slightly less than half, of the states report that some type of state plan for construction of academic facilities existed prior to Title I, comments of the agencies lead to the assumption that only a few were very comprehensive or current. For example, one state reports that a study was made in 1958 but that few of the recommendations had been implemented. Another reports that needs and priorities for construction were determined through the state capitol construction budget. A third state reports that all facilities planning was done by the state's Department of Administration.

Previous facilities planning for the state-supported institutions is being related to facilities planning under the facilities program in several ways. Five states with previous facility planning incorporated these plans directly into the facilities state plan. Six states used the previous plan to determine institutional construction projects to be submitted to the central agency under Title I, while seven report that the previous plans provided a basis for coordinating facilities planning for state institutions. Thus eighteen states have incorporated in some way their previous planning in present facilities planning.

Of the twenty-five states without prior facilities planning, eighteen are of the opinion that Title I has made a contribution to planning while seven believe that there has not been any influence. Possibly, among the seven reporting no effect on planning, the planning function had not yet been fully implemented at the time the questionnaire was answered. Moreover, the answers of several of these seven agencies would appear to be somewhat inconsistent with their other response indicating that facilities planning grants are being coordinated with general state planning.

State facilities planning has benefited from the flexibility provided in the Act under the provision which permits states to transfer excess funds between the separate federal allotments for the two-year institutions (Sec. 103) and the senior institutions (Sec. 104). Twenty states report having transferred excess funds from the allotment for two-year institutions to support unfunded projects of the senior institutions and twelve states have made the reverse transfer. This transfer authority has permitted these states to adapt the program more nearly to meet their particular needs. More than two-thirds of the thirty-three facilities agencies making an evaluation believe that this provision has enhanced state facilities planning, and many of the comments of the agencies stress the importance of this latitude to effective state planning.

Coordination Under the Act

As previously stated, in sixteen states the general coordinating agency is the designated agency to administer Title I of the Facilities Act. The fourteen agencies which answered believe that this new responsibility has favorably influenced their coordination function to some extent, with five reporting a very material effect. In the states where a facilities agency has been established and there is also a central coordinating agency either of the governing board, coordinating board, or state board of education type, the facilities agencies report that there have been varying degrees of cooperation with the coordinating agency. Only one state reports that there has been no coordination, while at the opposite extreme extensive coordination is reported by seven facilities agencies.

Not surprising is the fact that only three of these separately created facilities agencies believe that it would be desirable to have the coordinating agency administer Title I. The reasons given for maintaining separate facilities agencies are the same as those given for initially establishing separate agencies to administer the program: (1) that the coordinating agencies are not "broadly representative" of all types of institutions, including especially the private instituions, and in some instances, the junior or community college; (2) that the authority of the central state agency does not include operating programs but is limited to planning or advisory responsibilities; (3) that the central coordinating agency has shown a disinclination to assume the additional responsibility; and (4) that the facilities agency is a general state agency charged with the responsibility for all state construction programs.

Inclusion of Titles II and III of the Facilities Act Under the Program

The three governing boards and two state boards of education with coordinating responsibilities that administer the facilities programs all favor the conversion of Title II, providing grants for graduate facilities, from a program implemented directly with the institutions to a state-coordinated program administered by them. More than half of the coordinating agencies and of the special agencies responsible for Title I that express an opinion concur with this view. The comments of many of the agencies that would favor a change emphasize the advantage to state planning efforts in administering both graduate and undergraduate facilities grants or point out the present difficulties where institutional projects are for joint or combined facilities. Some that prefer the present arrangement stress the regional or national nature of graduate programs, the absence of objective criteria for determining priorities for graduate projects, the difficulty in determining state allotments, and the inadequate size or expertise of staff to handle the additional and different problems.

With regard to Title III of the Facilities Act, authorizing loans for construction, the agencies respond in about the same proportion as they do with respect to Title II, although individual agencies may give different responses. The comments cover the same general reasons as those given above for Title II. In reply to both queries, a few express indifference as to the administrative procedures, and a few suggest clearing Title II and Title III projects through the facilities agencies for final decision in Washington, without using prior state allotments.

Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction

Higher Education Act of 1965 - Title VI
Part A - Equipment

Grants to assist in the improvement of undergraduate instruction are authorized in two parts of this title to the Higher Education Act. Part A provides funds for equipment and Part B - Faculty Development Programs, authorizes funds for workshops and institutes. It is the first part, referred to here as Title VI A, that is a state-coordinated federal program and is included in the present study.

This title states in part that "matching funds for fifty percent of equipment project costs are provided for the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment suitable for use in sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, history, geography, government, English, other humanities, the arts of education at the undergraduate level." Funds are also available for closed circuit television.

States are required to designate a state agency to administer the program and to prepare a state plan giving criteria and weights to be assigned to projects for the determination of priorities. The section of the Act prescribing the requirements for the state agency and the state plan is the same as the wording of the corresponding section in Title I of the Facilities Act. Perhaps because grants authorized by Title VI A are for laboratory and instructional equipment, this program was seen as sufficiently related to Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act for the Office of Education to suggest to the states that administration be assigned to the agency responsible for the Facilities Act.

Because the same agency administers both the Facilities Act and Title VI A and because the requirements for the state plans are so similar, agencies administering these programs were asked to respond to both programs in the same questionnaire. Opportunities, however, were given to differentiate between the two programs on some matters. Certain differences between Title VI A and Title I of the Facilities Act were found in three states. California has a separate advisory committee for each program; Georgia used a consulting agency for Title I of HEFA but not for Title VI A; and Vermont reports seeking the help of a statewide organization of colleges and universities, private and public, for Title I but not for Title VI A. Except for these differences and for the inquiries directed to Title I only, responses and opinions are applicable to both Title I of HEFA and Title VI A of HEA.

This program, as is the case with Title I of the Facilities Act, is believed by the administering agencies to have contributed to the coordination and planning efforts of the states.

Community Service and Continuing Education Program:
Title I - Higher Education Act of 1965

Provisions of the Act

The Community Service and Continuing Education Program (Title I - HEA) is another federal program requiring states to designate or create a central administering agency and to prepare a state plan. Because the scope of Title I - HEA is broad enough to encompass almost any public service and continuing education activity in which an institution of higher education might engage, it has the potential for some influence on the coordination and planning activities of a state. Its actual influence thus far has been limited due principally to the relatively small amount of funds appropriated.

Colleges and universities may conduct projects authorized by this Act which would assist "in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use." To coordinate institutional projects at the state level, project proposals must be evaluated and approved according to a state plan. Coordination is achieved through the adoption each fiscal year by the state agency with the help of an advisory committee of an annual program consisting of the community service and continuing education projects to be conducted by the various institutions during that fiscal year.

Coordination of the program at the national level is achieved through policies and regulations prepared by the Commissioner of Education with the suggestions and advice of a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education appointed by the President. This Advisory Council must make an annual review of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program and must make reports of its findings to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and to the President. The approval of the annual program by the Commissioner of Education and the annual review by the Advisory Council gives the federal agency the opportunity for continuing evaluation of the impact of the national program and permits changes in direction or emphasis which can affect state plans.

The administering state agency or institution must have "special qualifications with respect to solving community problems" and must be "broadly representative of institutions of higher education in a state which are competent to offer community service programs." The title provides, however, that if a state wishes to designate an agency or institution which does not meet the criterion of being sufficiently representative, it may do so, if the agency or institution takes the proper action to qualify itself, or if it appoints an advisory council which meets these qualifications. Broad representation is thus assured for the development or approval of a community service and continuing education state plan.

Table 5

STATE AGENCIES OR INSTITUTIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR TITLE I - COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

State	Agency or Institution	Categories					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Alabama	University of Alabama						X
Alaska	University of Alaska						X
Arizona	University of Arizona						X
Arkansas	University of Arkansas						X
California	Coordinating Council for Higher Education		X				
Colorado	Colorado Commission on Higher Education		X				
Connecticut	The Commission on Aid to Higher Education				X		
Delaware	University of Delaware						X
Florida	State Board of Education			X			
Georgia	The University of Georgia						X
Hawaii	State Department of Budget and Finance					X	
Idaho	Board of Regents	X					
Illinois	Board of Higher Education		X				
Iowa	State Board of Regents	X					
Kansas	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X		
Kentucky	University of Kentucky						X
Louisiana	Louisiana Commission on Extension and Continuing Education					X	
Maine	University of Maine						X
Maryland	University of Maryland						X

Note: Categories of Agencies:

1. Governing board
2. Coordinating board
3. State board of education
4. State agency administering Title I, Facilities Act
5. State agency
6. University

Indiana was not participating at time of survey.

Table 5 (Continued)

State	Agency or Institution	Categories 1	2	3	4	5	6
Massachusetts	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X		
Michigan	Bureau of Higher Education State Department of Education			X			
Minnesota	Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission		X				
Mississippi	Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning	X					
Missouri	Department of Community Affairs					X	
Montana	Montana State University						X
Nebraska	University of Nebraska						X
Nevada	University of Nevada						X
New Hampshire	University of New Hampshire						X
New Jersey	Department of Community Affairs					X	
New Mexico	University of New Mexico						X
New York	Board of Regents-State Education Department			X			
North Carolina	State Board of Higher Education		X				
North Dakota	Higher Education Facilities Commission				X		
Ohio	Ohio Board of Regents		X				
Oklahoma	University of Oklahoma						X
Oregon	Educational Coordinating Council		X				
Pennsylvania	Department of Public Instruction			X			
Rhode Island	University of Rhode Island						X
South Carolina	University of South Carolina						X
South Dakota	Commission on Education Facilities				X		
Tennessee	University of Tennessee						X
Texas	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System		X				
Utah	Coordinating Council of Higher Education		X				
Vermont	University of Vermont						X
Virginia	University of Virginia						X
Washington	Planning & Community Affairs Agency					X	
West Virginia	West Virginia University						X
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin						X
Wyoming	University of Wyoming						X
Totals		3	9	4	5	5	23

State Agencies Administering the Act

Since the community service agencies or institutions share, even if in a small way, in the planning and coordination of one aspect of higher education in a state, these agencies may have some effect on general planning and coordination. The designated agencies for this program are listed in Table 5.

There are six different types of agencies administering Title I: governing boards, coordinating boards, state boards of education, facilities agencies, government agencies, and universities. Twenty-three, or almost half, of the administering agencies are institutions of higher education which are in every case except one, viz., a land-grant institution, the state university. This is a marked difference from the facilities program, for the administration of which no state designated an institution as the responsible agency. Obviously, an institution does not meet the requirement of being representative of all higher education in a state, except in a state where there is only one eligible institution; consequently, in all states where institutions administer the program, and advisory council has been appointed.

In five states with governing or coordinating boards, special agencies having responsibility for the Facilities Act were also designated to administer the Community Service Program. In these states an agency other than the central governing or coordinating agency has been given added responsibility for planning and coordination and now administers three federal programs, giving greater potential to affect statewide planning and coordination generally.

General or specific purpose government agencies which are neither higher education coordinating agencies, state facilities agencies, nor higher education institutions are responsible for the community services program in five states. In the forty-nine participating states only three governing boards, nine coordinating boards and three state departments of education with some responsibility for higher education were designated as administering agencies for the program. In these states where there are both coordinating agencies and community service agencies, the latter were asked to give reasons why the coordinating board was not assigned this responsibility. Answers varied but generally they fall into four categories: the university or special agency was better qualified, the designated agency already handled other federal programs, the responsibility for program operation was not consistent with the authority and role of the coordinating agency, or, simply, that the choice was made by the governor. The comment from the designated administering institution in a state having a governing board for all the state-supported institutions is illustrative: "Board of Regents is a policy-making and governing board--not a program operating body . . . judgment has been that the state agency for Title I should be an operating education institution with a comprehensive program and background of experience."

All states responding had appointed advisory councils with the exception of three states. In these three the designated agency meets the qualifications of being representative of all institutions. Two of the three are agencies administering the Facilities Act and the third is a state agency with general responsibility for extension and continuing education in a state.

Organization of the Agencies

Although community service agencies have for the most part operated with very few administrative and clerical personnel, they nevertheless report that the staff is adequate. Of the total sample of thirty-seven states responding, twenty have only one administrative person and fifteen have only one clerical person. Although thirty-four states report that the staff is adequate, eleven say that federal funds have been inadequate to carry out fully their responsibilities under the program. According to the agencies reporting, the level of the federal contribution to administrative costs varies between thirty and seventy-five percent of the total.

Acceptance by the Institutions

In the opinion of the community service agencies, both public and private institutions of higher education generally have approved of the administration of this program through a state agency rather than negotiating directly with the U. S. Office of Education. Two agencies state that in the beginning some institutions had doubts about the way the program was being administered through a central state agency but that those doubts had been dispelled. In one state where there is a "strong" university administering the program, there is still doubt on the part of some of the other institutions about one institution administering the program. In no state, however, has a participating institution made a formal protest of an action of the administering agency.

Impact on Planning and Coordination

The community service agencies report that prior to the enactment of Title I-HEA most states did not have a state plan for their community services activities. Only three agencies, of a total of thirty-seven responding, say that there was a general state plan prior to the 1965 Act, but eleven others indicate that,although there was not a state plan as such, there was a general understanding among the institutions as to their respective roles in this program area. In regard to the coordination of community service programs prior to Title I, twelve agencies report that some degree of coordination existed among the state-supported institutions. In five states this function, to the extent that it was exercised, was the responsibility of statewide governing boards, and in four states that of the coordinating boards. The state university had this responsibility in three states. Nine agencies report that there was no coordination and ten report that such coordination as existed was strictly voluntary. Clearly, prior to Title I, any statewide planning of community service activities was almost non-existent and effective coordination of such programs in the institution was minimal. Each institution, public and private, developed its own programs in accord with its own institutional interests. Among the public institutions, coordination in most states was probably largely incidental to review and approval of budget requests.

Title I - HEA requires that the state plan shall "set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and state-wide system of community service programs under which funds paid to the state . . . will be expended solely for community service programs which have been approved by the agency or institution administering the plan." As a result of the formulation of state plans and their administration by state agencies and institutions, two-thirds of the administering agencies expressing an opinion believe that increased coordination in the community service area has been achieved. A few agencies said that as of the time of their response it was yet too early to determine whether coordination would be enhanced; several believe that the planning and coordination envisaged by the Act is not possible under the present limited level of funding; and a number draw a distinction between cooperation and coordination, commenting that while interinstitutional cooperation has been encouraged, a real statewide coordinated approach to the state's problems in this area has not yet developed.

To obtain information about the influence of community service state planning on higher education planning generally in a state, several questions were directed to this point. From the comments of the responding community service agencies, apparently the state plan for community service was developed in closer cooperation with the advisory committee and with other state agencies and the institutions than was the case with the facilities state plan. Perhaps the reason is that the guidelines for the community service plan are not as detailed and structured as those for the facilities state plan. With greater freedom at the state level in developing a state plan and with many people being involved in the preparation of the plan, some contribution to educational planning generally in this area and perhaps to overall planning might be expected.

In the fifteen states in which Title I - HEA is administered by the general governing or coordinating agency, eight of these agencies believe that their administration of this program has been of aid to them in carrying out their responsibilities for general state planning and coordination. Two of the agencies believe that this has not been the result and five did not respond.

In states with governing or coordinating agencies which do not administer the program, the extent of coordination, if any, between the planning and other activities of the administering agency and the higher education coordinating agency is of some importance. Unfortunately, the number of states responding to this question is too small to contribute much to an understanding of the relationship between the two agencies, but of the community services agencies which did answer, one-half say that coordination between the agencies has been extensive while only one state reports that there has been none.

Analysis of the answers to the question of cooperation between the special agency and the general coordinating agency reveals that some of the administering agencies and institutions have little knowledge or some confusion concerning statewide coordination. Answers from seven states were inappropriate because the respondent indicated either that his state does not have a coordinating agency when actually it does, or that there was some degree of cooperation when, in fact, his state does not have a coordinating agency.

In the twenty-three states which have designated special agencies or institutions to administer the community service program rather than their statewide governing or coordinating agencies, the consensus of the administering agencies responding (twelve) is that this division of responsibility has not affected general planning and coordinating in the state. Moreover, the consensus of these special administering agencies is that it would not be desirable to transfer the responsibility for Title I to the general state coordinating agencies. This reaction is not surprising for few who exercise authority desire to relinquish it. Those who give reasons for their opinions emphasize substantially the same points that were given for initially designating a special agency or institution rather than the coordinating agency to administer the program.

General Impact of Community Service Programs

A large majority of the community service agencies administering this program believe that Title I - HEA has increased state attention in this area. As stated by one administering institution: "For the first time institutions and state agencies have become acutely alerted to the problems and opportunities in this area." But several agencies complain that this increased interest on the part of the state has not extended to the state legislature and has not resulted in increased state support for the program. On the other hand, one agency reports that its legislature has authorized a parallel program and appropriated funds to finance it for a two-year period.

Twenty-seven of the community service agencies and institutions comment on other general or specific effects. Most of the comments are included in the following summary of these opinions:

1. All types of higher education institutions have shown an increased interest in expanding their community service activities.

2. All institutions are better aware of what each can do with its given resources.

3. Cooperation between institutions has increased and more joint programs, even between public and private institutions, have been developed.

4. A closer relationship has been created between institutions and communities because community leaders have been involved and have become aware that higher education is interested in their problems on more than a laboratory basis.

5. Progress is being made toward establishing extension as a recognized and supported responsibility of the state university system.

6. Title I is a good example of a federal-state partnership program with initiative and responsibility left to the states.

7. The program has strengthened the coordinating board by involving private institutions and giving them a greater awareness and understanding of its activities.

Five of the general comments are deserving of especial attention because they introduce some fundamental questions regarding the program. The administrator for the Title I program at a university which implements the program under the direction of the statewide governing board raises a question as to institutional commitments and institutional organization to meet the demands and opportunities of the program.

> The questionnaire does not touch on the basic organizational problem of Title I. Specifically, institutions are not presently staffed or organized for an orderly prosecution of community problems. I would imagine that a hard look at Title I programs throughout the states would show that they represent in many instances the interests of individual professors or at most of departments. Clear institution commitments to community problem solving are

> lacking as is institutional (interdepartmental) direction of programs. Lacking also is true institutional involvement with the community. At the present time, the most important impact of Title I is in this area of institutional awareness of their own staffing and organizational needs for orderly prosecution of community problems. This impact is being felt.

The administrator for the program at a state university which is the administering agency stresses the importance of the academic rather than the governmental approach to the direction of the program.

> I hope we can follow an "academic" model, but I am fearful we will not. Just the tone of your question indicates that many states look on Title I as a simple mechanical process of having a state coordinating agency for higher education set up a statewide system of continuing education divorced from the academic disciplines and departments of colleges. The real question is not how Title I is administered but whether it is being administered in such a way as to use the special competencies and resources of the academic people in our colleges. This requires administration by academics who are aware of the knowledge available in college departments and who can encourage other academics to become involved in community problem solving. By definition, in the Act, knowledge is available on college campuses (and I believe, in fact, it is), but is no easy task to transfer this knowledge to communities. However, this transfer is the responsibility of the state Title I agencies and not of the colleges. State bureaus have been notably inadequate in directing institutions of higher education, and particularly the normal college professor within the institutions. Yet it is he - the professor deep within the department - and his knowledge which must be brought to bear on community problems

> if the promise of Title I is to be realized. Community problems can be, and are, attacked by many governmental agencies; let's hope that Title I does not turn into just another governmental agency.

A similar thesis is expressed by the academic director for the program at another state university acting as the administering agency.

> "Coordination" is usually considered "good," but we would question this. We are attempting to achieve the ends desired when planning and coordination are attempted through more positive leadership and fair administrative systems.

These comments raise basic questions concerning the extent of institutional commitment to community service activities by institutions of higher education, the appropriate institutional organization to meet effectively the demands upon its faculty to lend their expertise to the solution of community problems, and the most appropriate means of coordinating the efforts of faculties of various institutions. They reflect the reactions of institutions charged with the responsibility for implementing the community service programs to problems inherent in finding appropriate and viable means to meet the increasing demands upon academic institutions for greater participation in the solution of community problems.

A comment by the program director of a coordinating board responsible for this program is critical of the "maintenance of effort" requirements of the Act which require participating institutions to document to the state administering agency that the level of non-federal expenditures for community service and continuing education programs in the year of application are at least equal to such expenditures in the preceeding year, or in 1965. He sees no reason for having two separate maintenance of effort provisions, one relating to community services and the other to continuing education and extension programs, and he points out the great difficulty of documenting these requirements in a state which has a fiscal year different from the federal fiscal year.

The final comment to be especially noted is from a general state agency in a state with major metropolitan centers:

> . . . what is needed at this time is for Congress to reassess the whole extension movement in light of demographic shift and technological advances, coupled with the national urban crisis.

> What, in essence, is needed is a commitment by Congress to shift the support, both verbal and monetary, from the rural sector to the urban-suburban--where the vast majority of our population now resides.

In emphasizing the need for greater attention and greater support, he is expressing the opinion of many of the administering agencies. Both in the interviews and in the questionnaires, a number of the agencies called attention to the limitations imposed by the present level of federal support. Emphasized was the necessity for a greater federal investment and the desirability for a higher level of federal matching if institutions were to meet more effectively the challenges and opportunities in this area. More money, however, would not necessarily provide the answers to the basic problems of institutional priority and organization and interinstitutional coordination raised by the previous comments.

State Technical Services Act of 1965

Provisions of the Act

Although the State Technical Services Program is not as directly related to higher education as the other federal programs considered in this study, it does involve institutions and agencies of higher education and it does require a central state agency to administer the program and to develop a state plan. Its purpose is "to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting state and interstate programs to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise." Although this purpose is achieved through programs conducted principally by colleges and universities, the objective of the program is to aid business enterprise and not higher education. Any aid to higher education results merely as an incident to the performance of activities intended for the benefit of the business and industrial sector of the state. This distinction from the other federal programs is further evidenced by the administration of this Act by the Department of Commerce rather than the Office of Education.

Technical services, for which the act provides grants matching fifty percent of the cost, include workshops, training programs, demonstrations, field visits, technical reports and films which dissiminate scientific and engineering information. Statewide coordination of this program is achieved in a slightly different way than for the other federal programs. The designated state agency or institution is responsible for developing a five-year plan and an annual technical services program. The five-year plan must recognize the technological and economic conditions of the state, identify the major regional and industrial problems, develop the approaches and methods to be used in the solution of these problems, and explain the methods to be used in the administration and coordination of the program.

Table 6

STATE AGENCIES OR INSTITUTIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT

State	Agency or Institution	Categories			
		1	2	3	4
Alabama	Alabama Community and Technical Services Agency			X	
Alaska	Department of Economic Development and Planning			X	
Arizona	University of Arizona				X
Arkansas	University of Arkansas				X
California	University of California-Berkeley				X
Colorado	Division of Commerce and Development			X	
Connecticut	Connecticut Research Commission			X	
Delaware	University of Delaware				X
Florida	Board of Regents	X			
Georgia	Board of Regents	X			
Hawaii	Department of Planning and Economic Development			X	
Idaho	Department of Commerce and Development			X	
Illinois	Department of Business and Economic Development			X	
Indiana[a]	Governor				
Iowa	Board of Regents[b] (Iowa State University)	X			

[a] Program not yet implemented when information from states was collected.

[b] The agency or office is classified as it is listed by the U. S. Department of Commerce. The institution or department in parentheses has responsibility for the actual administration.

Note: Categories of Agencies:

1. Governing board
2. Coordinating board
3. State agency
4. Institution

Table 6 (Continued)

State	Agency or Institution	Categories			
		1	2	3	4
Kansas	Research Foundation of Kansas[b] (Kansas State University)			X	
Kentucky	Department of Commerce			X	
Louisiana	Department of Commerce and Industry			X	
Maine	University of Maine				X
Maryland	University of Maryland				X
Massachusetts	Governor (University of Massachusetts)[b]				X
Michigan	Department of Commerce			X	
Minnesota	State Planning Agency			X	
Mississippi	Mississippi Research and Development Center			X	
Missouri	Division of Commerce and Industrial Development			X	
Montana	University of Montana				X
Nebraska	University of Nebraska				X
Nevada	University of Nevada				X
New Hampshire	Governor (University of New Hampshire)[b]				X
New Jersey	Department of Conservation and Economic Development			X	
New Mexico	University of New Mexico				X
New York	Department of Commerce			X	
North Carolina	State Department of Administration			X	
North Dakota	North Dakota State Planning Agency			X	
Ohio	Ohio Board of Regents		X		
Oklahoma	Oklahoma State University				X
Oregon	Division of Planning and Development			X	
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State University				X
Rhode Island	Governor (University of Rhode Island)[b]				X
South Carolina	State Development Board			X	

[a] Program not yet implemented when information from states was collected.

[b] The agency or office is classified as it is listed by the U. S. Department of Commerce. The institution or department in parentheses has responsibility for the actual administration.

Table 6 (Continued)

State	Agency or Institution	Categories			
		1	2	3	4
South Dakota	State Planning Agency			X	
Tennessee	University of Tennessee				X
Texas	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System		X		
Utah	University of Utah				X
Vermont	Governor (Vermont Development Department)[b]			X	
Virginia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute				X
Washington	Department of Commerce and Economic Development			X	
West Virginia	Department of Commerce			X	
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin				X
Wyoming	University of Wyoming				X
Totals		3	2	24	20

---

[a] Program not yet implemented when information from states was collected.

[b] The agency or office is classified as it is listed by the U. S. Department of Commerce. The institution or department in parentheses has responsibility for the actual administration.

The annual technical services program must contain the specific assignments of each participating institution and the relationship of the assignments to the five-year plan.

State Agencies Administering the Act

Agencies and institutions responsible for the State Technical Services Program are given in Table 6.

Table 6 shows that in almost half of the states an agency primarily concerned with economic planning and development in the state has been designated as the state administering agency. Institutions which are either the state university or the land-grant institution are next most frequently found as the administering agency. Since only five states--Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Ohio and Texas--designated their state governing or coordinating agency to administer this Act, thirty-three states, at the time of the survey, had both a central coordinating agency and a state technical services agency.

In view of the specific objective of this program, and the fact that so many non-educational agencies and so few governing and coordinating agencies have been assigned responsibility for its administration, it has not had and will not have as much impact on coordination and planning generally in a state as the other federal programs studied. At least the potential for contributing to coordination and planning is not as great.

Organization of the Agencies

All but six of the twenty-nine technical service agencies responding report that they have been adequately staffed. The staffs of the state agencies consist usually of one full time administrative person and one full time secretary. Only four agencies report employing more than two persons to administer the program. With such small staffs it might be expected that the administering agency would employ consultants, but of the twenty-nine states answering, only eight report using a professional consulting agency in developing their five-year plans. Seven of the eight regard the assistance of the consultant as having been materially helpful.

Federal funds have in most cases supported approximately fifty percent of the cost of administering the program. A few states report a substantially lower or higher figure. Nineteen agencies regard this federal support as adequate but ten say that the funds provided have not been sufficient to carry out fully their responsibilities under the program. A few express the opinion that federal funds should cover all administrative costs.

Each designated state agency is required by the Act to appoint an advisory council whose members represent broad community interests. Most states have fully met the requirement by providing representation on their advisory councils from business, industry, labor, government and education. The primary responsibility of these advisory councils is to review and assist in the development of the state plans. Most of the agencies report that the work of their advisory council has been quite helpful, and a number emphasize the great value derived from bringing together a diverse group of this nature to identify state problems in the area and to plan constructively for their solution.

Acceptance by the Institutions

The administering state agencies report that the colleges and universities which have prepared and conducted technical service programs generally approve of the way the Act has been administered under the state plan. For the non-state-supported institutions the reaction reported is one of overwhelming approval, although in one state general disapproval by the private institutions is reported. In only one state has an institution made a formal protest of an administering agency's action.

Impact on Planning and Coordination

The impact of the Technical Services Program on planning and coordination is analyzed first as to its effect on the planning and coordination of technical service activities of the state. Sixteen states report that some of their educational institutions were conducting technical services programs prior to the passage of the Act. The number is probably considerably larger because a considerable group of the agencies did not answer this question and others were understandably doubtful as to the types of programs included within the term "technical service programs." However, only two states report the existence of a state plan for the coordination of technical services programs prior to the Act. Four states report that, although there was no formal plan, there was a general understanding among the institutions as to their areas of interest. Three states say that some limited coordination of institutional activities in this area was exercised by their coordinating agencies and five report that there was some voluntary coordination by the institutions of their programs. In the opinion of twenty-one of the administering agencies responding, the State Technical Services Program has resulted in a greater degree of coordination of these programs among the institutions, but six do not believe that result has yet been achieved.

Next to be considered is the impact, if any, on general state planning and coordination of higher education. As previously indicated, this Act is administered by only five governing or coordinating agencies. Four of the five believe that their responsibility for the Act has aided their general planning and coordinating activities; the other feels that there has been no effect. Only thirteen responses were received from the thirty-three special agencies or institutions administering the program in states which also have general governing or coordinating agencies. Three of these agencies believe that their administration of the Act has been of some assistance to general state planning and coordination, but the other ten state that there has not been any effect in this general area.

Coordination between the agencies administering the State Technical Services Program and the general governing and coordinating agencies appears to be considerably less than that reported between the administering agencies and the central state agencies for each of the other three federal programs. This opinion is not surprising because the basic objective of the program is to assist business and not education, and almost half of the administering agencies for this program are not directly concerned with higher education. These same reasons would also explain why not one of the thirteen state agencies expressing an opinion believes that it would be desirable for the administration of the program to be transferred to the general coordinating agencies, and why one coordinating agency states that the administrative responsibility for the Act should be shifted from it to a special agency.

Two areas of interstate regional development related to the State Technical Services Program are reported, one among the Rocky Mountain states and the other among the New England states. In the Rocky Mountain region the coordination is reported as limited to special merit programs only. The states in these regions report that at the time of the study it was yet too early to assess the ultimate value of these cooperative programs.

Other General or Specific Effects

Twenty-five of the technical services agencies or institutions made specific comments in the questionnaires or interviews concerning effects of the program other than its relation to planning and coordination. Fourteen of these comments which emphasize favorable aspects or developments of the program can be summarized in the following statements:

1. The program has developed closer working relationships among the institutions and between the institutions and business and industry, and has brought acceptance of the program as a worthwhile service by both groups.

2. It has brought a concentration on problem areas, rather than on just what the institutions have to offer.

3. It has brought an awareness among the educational institutions of how little they have really ser-

viced the business community and has changed the focus of their programs to one of service.

4. It has increased the interest of state government in this area, which has resulted in increased state support for this or related state programs.

Among comments critical of the program are the following:

1. The size of the program is so limited as to have no great impact; funding should be sharply increased or it should be dropped.

2. The matching funds requirements cause difficulty in financing projects and in administration.

3. The emphasis of the federal requirements has been placed on "compliance" rather than on providing leadership, and the complicated reporting system to show "compliance" uses up too much of the funds which should be placed into service and will hold back program implementation when additional funds become available.

4. The program finances only transmission of data--not research to produce data; therefore institutions have only limited interest.

5. Administrative interpretations should be broadened to include management development programs.

Other miscellaneous complaints are made but, more importantly, in a number of the interviews general observations were made concerning the limited funding provided by Congress. Undoubtedly, these general criticisms of the level of funding represent the feelings of a considerable number of the technical services agencies. Several agencies and institutions report that the program, at the time of the survey, was just being implemented or that implementation was so recent as to make impossible any real assessment of its operation or its ultimate contributions.

Summary

This chapter has examined each of the four state-coordinated federal programs from the point of view of the state agencies administering these programs. The purpose and basic requirements provided in the respective Congressional Acts have been noted; the state organizations administering the programs have been identified; the effect of the planning and coordinating activities of the state administering agencies for each of the programs both in the area of their specific responsibility and on the general state function of planning and coordinating higher education has been examined; and other general and special effects of each of the programs have been noted.

The broader implications of these programs and the evaluation of their impact on state planning and coordination of higher education by state governors, state governing and coordinating agencies and college and university presidents are analyzed in detail in Chapter 3. The following summary of certain phases of the material in this chapter is intended as a basis for that analysis.

Two factors affecting the impact of the state-coordinated federal programs on state planning and coordination of higher education are the types of state agencies designated or created to administer the programs and the extent of concentration or dispersal of administrative authority for these programs in or among these state agencies.

The types of state agencies most frequently administering the four federal programs are a separately created agency for the Facilities Act and Title VI A of the Higher Education Act, a state university for the Community Service and Continuing Education Title and a state agency not related to higher education for the State Technical Services Act.

Of the thirty-eight central coordinating agencies, a total of twenty-three, seven of thirteen statewide governing boards, thirteen of twenty-one coordinating boards, and three of four state boards of education with some responsibility for planning and coordination, have been designated to administer one or more of the four state-coordinated federal programs. The program with the most potential to affect statewide coordination and planning, Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act, is administered by sixteen of the thirty-eight central agencies. The Community Service and Continuing Education Program is the responsibility of fifteen of these agencies and the State Technical Services Act is administered by five.

One governing board administers the two facilities programs and the community service program; the governing boards in two states administer the two facilities programs; one governing board administers both the Title I - HEA and technical services programs; two are responsible only for the technical services program; and one is the administering agency for only the community service program.

Among the coordinating boards, two, in Ohio and Texas, are responsible for all but four programs, five administer all but the technical services program, four administer only the two facilities programs, and two have responsibility only for the community service program.

Table 7

CENTRAL COORDINATING AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR STATE-COORDINATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS

State	Title I HEFA	Title VI A HEA	Title I HEA	STSA
Governing Boards				
Idaho	X	X	X	
Arizona	X	X		
Nevada	X	X		
Iowa			X	X
Florida				X
Georgia				X
Mississippi			X	
Alaska				
Montana				
Rhode Island				
Kansas				
North Dakota				
South Dakota				
Coordinating Boards				
Ohio	X	X	X	X
Texas	X	X	X	X
California	X	X	X	
Colorado	X	X	X	
Illinois	X	X	X	
Minnesota	X	X	X	
Oregon	X	X	X	
Arkansas	X	X		
Missouri	X	X		
New Mexico	X	X		
Oklahoma	X	X		
North Carolina			X	
Utah			X	
Connecticut				
Kentucky				
Maryland				
Massachusetts				

Table 7 (Continued)

State	Title I HEFA	Title VI A HEA	Title I HEA	STSA
New Hampshire				
South Carolina				
Virginia				
Wisconsin				
State Boards of Education				
New York	X	X	X	
Michigan	X	X	X	
Pennsylvania			X	
New Jersey				

Of the four state boards of education with coordinating responsibilities, the New York and Michigan boards administer all but the technical services program. In Pennsylvania, the Department of Public Instruction has responsibility only for the community service program.

These figures show that of the three types of general coordinating agencies the governing boards are somewhat less involved with the administration of the four federal programs than are the coordinating boards or state boards of education. A smaller proportion of the governing boards have responsibility for any of the federal programs, and those that do have are responsible for fewer of these programs.

In twenty-seven states specially created facilities agencies have been designated to administer the two facilities programs. In five of these states the facilities agencies have been given the added responsibility for administering the Community Service and Continuing Education Title. Since three of the five states have statewide governing boards and two have coordinating boards, this concentration of responsibility for three of the federal programs in the facilities agencies could have an adverse effect on the central agencies unless there is coordination between the two.

In twelve states the same institution of higher education is responsible for both the community service and technical services programs. Five of these institutions are in states which have coordinating boards and three are in states with statewide governing boards. Two of these coordinating boards and two of the governing boards administer the facilities programs. Here too, unless there is some coordination between these administering institutions and the central agencies, the planning and coordinating activities of the latter could be made more difficult.

The impact of the state-coordinated programs on statewide coordination may occur in different ways. The coordination of any aspect of higher education at the state level will have some effect on statewide coordination. Consequently, to the extent that each of the federal programs accomplishes coordination within its respective area, potentially coordination generally may be supported, provided there is some consistency between the special and general efforts. The central coordinating agencies administering these programs believe that they have contributed to statewide coordination, but other types of administering agencies generally do not recognize that the programs have had any effect on the general coordinating function of the state.

Another way in which coordination may be affected is through the concentration of dispersion of responsibility for these programs in state agencies. As mentioned previously there are two states, Ohio and Texas, where all four programs are the responsibility of the coordinating board. At the other extreme there are sixteen states in which the central coordinating agency is not responsible for any of the federal programs.

Twenty-two states have both a central coordinating agency and a separate facilities agency. In twenty-three states an agency other than the central coordinating agency administers the Community Service and Continuing Education Title, and in thirty-three states there is both a central coordinating agency and a technical services agency. Also, as previously indicated, in five states with governing or coordinating agencies, the facilities agencies are responsible for the community services programs, and in eight states with central coordinating agencies, an institution of higher education administers both the community service and technical services programs. Under these circumstances, if coordination generally is to be augmented, there must be cooperation between administering agencies and central coordinating agencies.

In the opinion of the separate administering agencies for the four federal programs, considerable cooperation exists between these agencies and their central coordinating agencies. Only one agency responsible for the facilities programs and one agency administering the community service program report that no cooperation exists, and half of the respondents in each of these groups report that cooperation is extensive. Four of the separate technical services agencies report the absence of any cooperation with the central coordinating agency, but more than half of the respondents believe that there is a moderate degree of cooperation, and two believe that cooperation is extensive.

Implementation of the planning requirements of each of the four federal programs is another way in which the state function of planning and coordination of higher education may be affected. The development of state plans requires gathering and interpreting information concerning the program area, determining criteria and priorities, and evaluating proposed projects according to previously determined policies, criteria and priorities. These state plans are subject to approval by the federal administering agencies and must conform to general requirements prescribed either by the Congressional Acts or by the federal agencies. Moreover, state plans for these programs must apply to all institutions in a state, a requirement that extends the scope of planning beyond the direct responsibility of most central coordinating agencies.

A significant expansion in the planning area occurred when Title I of the Facilities Act was amended in 1965 to provide direct financing for comprehensive planning. The liberal interpretation given to "comprehensive planning to determine the construction needs of institutions" allows states to conduct studies and planning in a wide variety of areas. At the time information for this study was received, every state had applied for a planning grant and in most cases had received the funds. Almost all of the agencies administering the facilities programs report that these grants have been coordinated to some extent with general statewide planning.

The effect of the Community Service and Continuing Education Title has been to initiate some degree of planning in this area in most states; however, the small amount of funds appropriated and the newness of the program are factors limiting its influence on statewide planning. Agencies administering this program differ in their opinion as to the influence it has had on statewide planning. Central coordinating agencies responsible for the program believe that statewide planning has been supported while other administering agencies do not, although no agency in this latter category believes the effect has been adverse to state planning.

The State Technical Services Act differs from the other three state-coordinated federal programs in that its basic purpose is to aid business and industry in the states rather than higher education, although its purpose is achieved primarily by utilizing the expertise found in the institutions of higher education. In its planning requirements the Act also differs in that it requires a five-year plan. Each annual package of technical services programs must be approved within the purposes and priorities of the five-year plan. Prior to the State Technical Services Act only two states report having had a general state plan for these programs. As in the case of community services, the Technical Services Act has initiated some statewide planning in this area, however, the even smaller appropriations to the states for this program and the inexperience of state agencies and institutions with this type of program have limited the extent to which planning has developed. Despite these limitations the few central coordinating agencies administering the Technical Service program generally believe that there has been a favorable impact on statewide planning. A majority of the administering agencies that are not coordinating agencies express the opinion that statewide planning has not been affected.

As indicated at the beginning of this summary, the following chapter will consider the general impact of these four programs from the viewpoint of state governors, statewide governing and coordinating agencies, whether they administer some of the programs or not, and college and university presidents whose institutions are directly affected by the programs and by their administration.

Chapter 3

IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on the Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies

A logical approach to an appraisal of the effect of federal programs in aid of higher education on state planning and coordination of higher education is to consider first the impact of the recent federal programs in which Congress has provided the states a role in their implementation. Since one of the purposes of this joint federal-state responsibility is to give each state some opportunity to relate the programs to its own special needs or priorities, a direct effect on state planning and coordination would reasonably be expected. Moreover, in the thirty-eight states with general state agencies responsible to some degree for these state functions, the state-coordinated federal programs should have direct impact on these agencies and their general planning and coordinating activities. The nature of this impact may well depend on the extent to which these general agencies are assigned administrative responsibility for the federal programs by the state.

Effect on Organization, Authority, or Function

In assessing the impact of state-coordinated federal programs on the statewide governing or coordinating agencies, one important aspect to be considered is the extent to which responsibility for the administration of these federal programs has affected the basic organization, authority, or functions of these agencies.

Opinions of the Governing and Coordinating Agencies

Fourteen of the thirty-two agencies participating in this study report that one or more significant changes in their organization, authority or functions have occurred since 1962. The change occurring most frequently has been in the composition of the membership of the boards or commissions. Among the ten agencies reporting changes in membership, seven indicate that lay representation on their boards has been increased and two report an increase in total membership. Two states report that there has been a general reorganization of the agency, and five indicate that since 1962 increased authority has been given to the agency. In two other states, however, the power of the agencies has been reduced by removing their authority to review the budget requests of the institutions. The only change indicated in two replies was the establishment, or strengthening, of a central staff for the agency. Most of these changes have occurred in coordinating agencies. Of those responding, only three of nine governing boards and only one of three state boards of education report changes, but ten of eighteen coordinating agencies have been affected.

Only two of these fourteen state agencies, however, regard the state-coordinated federal programs as an appreciable contributing factor in bringing about these changes. One of the agencies states that "responsibility for administration of federal programs changed the character of the agency from advisory only to operational." The other answer states merely that the agency assumed responsibility for administering some of the federal programs, an answer which could have been given by twenty-three of the agencies.

Opinions of Presidents

Institutional presidents apparently see the state-coordinated federal programs as having had a greater influence on changes in the governing and coordinating agencies than do the agency directors. As indicated in Table 8, thirty-six presidents believe these programs have influenced recent changes in these agencies. However, of the twenty-nine presidents who give specific examples of the changes that have occurred, ten, or approximately one-third, give as the only impact the fact that the board or agency assumed responsibility for some or all of the state-coordinated federal programs. Seven presidents from two states indicate that responsibility for the administration of some of these federal programs has added operational authority to what previously had been only a review or advisory agency; two presidents state that administration of these federal programs has been used by the agencies to strengthen their power over the institutions; two presidents believe that this added administrative responsibility has caused the agencies to become more aware of the total educational picture; and the other replies cover a miscellanea of separate examples.

Not only are more changes reported in coordinating agencies than in statewide governing boards or state boards of education with some responsibility for higher education, but also, as shown in Table 8, many more presidents in states with coordinating agencies attribute the changes in their agencies to the agencies' added responsibility for administration of federal programs than do presidents in states with either of the other two types of coordination.

The greater number of changes in coordinating agencies since 1962 is attributable perhaps to the fact that this mode of coordination is newer and less well established or defined than the other two forms and, therefore, more apt to be affected by new responsibilities or external forces. But only in a few states is there evidence that responsibility for the administration of the state-coordinated federal programs has been an

Table 8

PRESIDENTS' OPINIONS ON IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON STATE AGENCIES

Question: If your state has a governing or coordinating board or agency which was in existence prior to 1964, have there been any significant changes since 1963 in its organization, authority, purpose or function which could be attributed to any appreciable extent to the impact of the state-coordinated Federal programs?

	Presidents' Responses			
Type of Coordination	Yes	No	Not to my Knowledge	No significant changes
Voluntary	--	--	--	--
Governing Board	8	17	3	--
Coordinating Agency	27	14	12	3
State Board of Education	1	6	2	1
No formal	--	--	--	--
	36	37	17	4
Type of Institution				
Public	26	31	4	3
Private	10	6	13	1
	36	37	17	4

Responses indicating no state agency - 30.

appreciable factor in these changes. The responses of the agencies do not so indicate, and any such implication which might be drawn from the number of presidents expressing this conclusion is negated by the nature of most of the presidents' examples of specific changes.

In California and, even more apparently, in Oregon the responsibility for administration of some of the state-coordinated federal programs has caused basic changes in the function of the coordinating agencies. According to some of the presidents in California, administration of the federal programs has added an operational function to what had previously been an advisory and planning agency. In Oregon, an informal advisory council to the governor was changed to an administrative agency by the assignment to it of the responsibility for administration of federal programs. As an academic administrator expressed it, "in meeting the requirements of the Federal programs, a new state structure was created." In addition to the statewide governing board for all public senior institutions and the State Board of Education for the community colleges, Oregon now has a coordinating agency administering three of the federal programs, including the undergraduate facilities program with its funds for statewide planning. Some in Oregon view this as a possible step toward a "superboard." There may have been other somewhat similar experiences in other states which have coordinating agencies with limited authority but the responses do not reveal them.

Four states--Minnesota, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Colorado--established coordinating agencies between 1964 and mid-1967, when this survey was initiated. In Connecticut and Colorado, the presidents do not believe that the creation of their coordinating agencies was influenced by the state-coordinated federal programs. In Minnesota, one of the two presidents responding thought that the federal programs were "one of several factors" contributing to the creation of the agency. In Massachusetts, two of the three presidents responding thought that the federal programs had been a contributing factor. Although these replies indicate an opinion that the federal programs have had some impact, without a larger sampling of opinions a meaningful assessment of the extent of their influence on the creation of these new coordinating agencies is not possible.

Opinions of the Governors

Eleven governors indicate that in their opinion the state-coordinated federal programs have influenced to some extent plans to strengthen or expand the authority of the existing coordinating agencies in their states. These eleven governors represent three states with state board of education responsibility for coordination, four states with statewide governing boards, and four states with coordinating agencies. One of the three governors of states with state board of education responsibility for higher education and two of the seven governors of states not having formal coordinating organizations indicate that the state-coordinated federal programs have influenced to some extent plans to establish a coordinating agency. To date, however, such agencies have not been established in these states.

Effect on the Influence, Standing and Acceptability of the Statewide Agencies

Lyman Glenny has expressed the opinion[8] that administration of state-coordinated federal programs by a coordinating agency strengthens and gives added stability and influence to the agency. The responses from the statewide agencies indicate that this opinion is shared by most of them. Of the twenty boards or agencies with responsibility for the administration of some or all of the state-coordinated federal programs that responded, only three indicate that this administrative responsibility has not affected the influence and standing of the agency. Ten express the opinion that their administration of these programs has had such an effect and seven others believe that this has been the effect to a limited extent.

Of the ten agencies which recognize a definite favorable influence, four relate this to their influence with the private institutions, two stress the importance of the new administrative function, one emphasizes the greater leadership role of the agency, one stresses the strengthening of the planning function of the agency, and one comments on the "natural tendency to take more seriously an agency with funds to allocate." Of these ten definite affirmative replies, eight are from coordinating agencies, one is from a governing board, and one is from a state department of education. Of the seven agencies indicating only a limited effect on their influence and standing, four replies are from governing boards, two are from coordinating agencies and one is from a state board of education.

In their general assessment of the impact of the state-coordinated federal programs, eleven of the thirty-six participating governors state that administration of some or all of these programs by their state agency has tended to give that agency greater stability or stature. These governors represent two states with state board of education responsibility and nine states with coordinating agencies. These responses from state agencies and governors indicate that the state-coordinated federal programs have apparently had a somewhat greater impact on coordinating agencies than on the other two types of agencies. This result is not unexpected because the still developing role of the coordinating agency in many states would tend to be strengthened by any added authority.

---

[8] Glenny, Lyman A., "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," Campus and Capitol, ed. W. John Minter (Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966), pp. 39-41.

Although the presidents were not specifically queried on this point, their responses to the previous question regarding the effect of the state-coordinated federal programs on changes in the organization, authority, or function of statewide governing and coordinating agencies are more applicable to this question as to the impact of these programs on the stature and standing of the statewide agencies. An appreciable number recognize that administration of the federal programs has provided some stability to the agencies and has increased their influence and stature. A few, particularly among those interviewed, expressed some concern over the expanding authority of the coordinating agencies.

Effect on the Planning and Coordinating Responsibilities of the Governing and Coordinating Agencies

Aside from these general effects, the nature of the impact of their administration of state-coordinated federal programs on the planning and coordinating responsibilities of the statewide agencies is a primary concern. This question was approached generally, and specifically in regard to each of the four federal programs investigated.

General Impact

When the twenty-three governing and coordinating agencies that are responsible for the administration of one or more of the federal programs were queried about the general impact of these programs on their planning and coordinating responsibilities, nine of the agencies, eight coordinating agencies and a state board of education, express the opinion that these new responsibilities have substantially aided them in carrying out their planning and coordinating functions. An additional four, three governing boards and a coordinating agency, believe that administration of these federal programs has been of limited aid in this respect. A governing board feels that these programs have been effective in supporting its planning and coordinating responsibilities only in the area of construction planning; a coordinating agency believes that these programs have impeded it in its planning and coordinating responsibility to a limited extent; and two others, a coordinating agency and a state board of education, express the opinion that the federal programs have had no effect upon these responsibilities.

Of the nine agencies that believe that the federal programs have been of substantial aid to their planning and coordinating functions, one is responsible for all four federal programs, four are responsible for all but the technical services program and three administer the two facilities programs. However, the two agencies reporting "no effect" also administer all except the technical services program. Ten of the thirteen agencies reporting either a limited or substantial favorable effect are responsible for administering the facilities program.

The agencies that give a favorable opinion emphasize that the federal programs have: (1) provided the opportunity to integrate state programs and goals with federal programs and goals, (2) provided some specific bases for role assignment through the necessity of deciding priorities, (3) facilititated and focused on planning programs for facilities and program development, (4) fitted in with existing functions and activities, but provided added importance to these activities, (5) brought about closer involvement of the private institutions and made the Board more acceptable to them by the help it provides, (6) resulted in participation of all public and private institutions in statewide planning, and (7) provided additional staff for planning and coordination.

Impact of Specific Programs

This general reaction to the administration of federal programs as it affects the planning and coordinating function of the governing and coordinating agencies can be compared with the specific reations of these agencies to questions related to their administration of any of the four federal programs for which they have responsibility. The following paragraphs collate and summarize material presented in Chapter 2.

With regard to their planning activities, seven of the sixteen statewide governing and coordinating agencies administering the undergraduate facilities program indicate the administration of this program has materially aided and abetted the carrying out of their responsibility for statewide master planning for higher education, and seven indicate that this additional administrative responsibility has been of some assistance to their general planning functions.

With regard to the impact on their general coordinating functions, five of the sixteen agencies believe that the administration of the undergraduate facilities program has materially helped in carrying out their coordinating responsibilities and nine indicate that it has aided to some degree their coordinating activities.

Significantly, all responses to both questions report a favorable effect. Not one of the governing boards or coordinating agencies expresses the opinion that responsibility for administration of this program has interfered with or detracted from either its master planning or its coordinating function. Since the same agencies administering the undergraduate facilities program also administer the academic equipment program under Title VI A, Higher Education Act, the above responses are applicable to both programs.

Of the thirty-seven responses from agencies and institutions administering the community service and continuing education program, ten are from the fifteen general coordinating agencies which have responsibility for this program. Two coordinating boards say that responsibility for the administration of this program has had little or no effect on their planning or coordinating activities; two agencies, a governing board and a coordinating board, believe that administration of the program has been of material aid; and six, including four coordinating agencies and two state boards of education, say that it has been of some help. None indicates that this program has interfered with or detracted from these activities.

Only five governing boards and coordinating agencies are responsible for the administration of the State Technical Services Act. Of the four responding to this query, one coordinating agency reports that administration of the Act has materially aided the planning and coordinating functions of the agency, another coordinating agency is of the opinion that its administration of this Act has had no effect on its performance of these functions, and two governing boards state that this additional administrative responsibility has been of limited assistance to their planning and coordinating activities.

Summary of the Effect on the Planning and Coordinating Responsibilities of the Governing and Coordinating Agencies

In summary, most statewide governing and coordinating agencies believe that their administration of state-coordinated federal programs has aided them at least to some extent in carrying out their responsibilities for planning and coordination of higher education. A greater proportion of the coordinating agencies assess this aid as being materially helpful than do the statewide governing boards and state boards of education. Only one agency, a coordinating agency, believes that its administration of one of these federal programs has impeded its general planning and coordinating functions, and only a few believe that this added administrative responsibility has had little or no effect on these primary functions.

Impact on Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies of Dispersal of Responsibility for Administration of State-Coordinated Federal Programs

In all but two of the states with general coordinating agencies, some or all of the state-coordinated federal programs are administered by special state agencies or academic institutions rather than by the statewide governing boards, coordinating agencies and state boards of education. This dispersal of responsibility for administration of these federal programs could be expected to have an adverse effect on the planning and coordinating responsibilities of these statewide agencies. To ascertain the extent and nature of this impact, the statewide governing and coordinating agencies were asked two questions: whether in any instance the designation of another agency or institution to administer a federal program has had an adverse effect on their planning and coordinating activities; and what has been the cumulative effect on their planning and coordinating activities of the assignment of two or more of the state-coordinated federal programs to other agencies or institutions?

In response to the first question, seventeen of the twenty-six agencies responding indicate that in no instance has the assignment of state-coordinated federal programs to other agencies or institutions had an adverse effect on their planning and coordinating functions. Nine report that in particular instances dispersal of responsibility for a federal program has had an adverse effect, but five of the nine agencies assess the effect as only somewhat adverse. All of the nine replies indicating an adverse effect are from coordinating boards. Five that specify the particular program which has had this effect name the undergraduate facilities program.

As to the cumulative effect, one agency believes that the dispersal of responsibility for administration of the federal programs had had a decidedly adverse effect on its planning and coordinating efforts and eight others assess the effect as somewhat adverse. The "decidedly adverse" reply and seven of the eight "somewhat adverse" reactions are from coordinating boards.

Six responses, three from governing boards and three from coordinating agencies, indicate that the dispersal of responsibility for the federal programs has had no appreciable effect on their planning and coordinating responsibilities. Three responses, one from each of the three types of statewide agencies, indicate that the federal programs even though administered by other agencies have aided their planning and coordinating activities. Nine of the governing and coordinating agencies administer all, or all but one, of the federal programs and five of the thirty-two respondents did not answer this question.

An analysis of these eighteen responses both on the basis of the number of programs assigned and on the basis of the particular programs assigned to the state agencies does not reveal any significant trends which would explain the different opinions expressed. An analysis based on the type of coordination, however, does reveal a significant difference. Two-thirds of the state coordinating boards responding believe that the administration of the state-coordinated federal programs by other state agencies or institutions has adversely affected, at least to some extent, their planning and coordinating efforts, but only one governing board holds this opinion. This reaction by so many of the state coordinating boards is another reflection of the sensitivity of many of these agencies to any actual or potential conflicting force which might affect their uncertain and still-developing role and status. The greater direct authority over the public institutions inherent in the status of the statewide governing boards and the fact that in a number of instances institutions under their governance are the designated administering agencies for the community service and technical services programs, reduces considerably the extent to which dispersal of administrative responsibility for the federal programs can adversely affect the governing boards.

Opinions on Consolidation of Administration of All State-Coordinated Federal Programs in Statewide Governing or Coordinating Agency

College and university presidents, state governors, and special agencies and institutions administering the state-coordinated federal programs were queried as to their opinions on the consolidation of the administration of all state-coordinated federal programs in the statewide governing and coordinating agencies.

Opinions of Presidents

Table 9 summarizes the responses of presidents in the twenty-one states with statewide governing and coordinating agencies which do not administer all of the state-coordinated federal programs. Other than the minority for whom consolidation would make no significant difference, a small majority of the public institution presidents and a bare majority of the private presidents oppose concentration of the administration of all state-coordinated programs in the general coordinating bodies. Although it is interesting to note that while a majority (i.e., of those expressing a definite opinion) of both the public and private presidents in states with coordinating agencies and a bare majority of public institution presidents in states with governing boards oppose this consolidation, the few private institution presidents in governing board states giving a definite answer all favor such concentration of administrative responsibility.

The presidents in states with coordinating boards which administer the two facilities programs are evenly divided on the question of concentrating all programs in this agency, but two-thirds of the presidents in coordinating board states where the facilities programs are administered by a separate agency are opposed to such consolidation. In other words, in coordinating board states where the facilities programs are under a separate agency, most of the presidents prefer not to have the authority of their coordinating agency increased by assigning to it the responsibility for all the federal programs, and half of the presidents in states where the coordinating board administers the facilities program would not want this board to have the additional responsibility for the other programs.

Sixty percent of the presidents in states with governing boards who express a preference favor consolidation and this percentage holds regardless of whether the governing board or a separate agency administers the facilities programs. However, all but one of the several presidents in governing board states who express indifference as to what agencies administer the federal programs are in states where the facilities programs are administered by separate agencies. In other words, they would not object to consolidation of all programs in the governing board.

The conclusion to be drawn from these analyses is that the presidents in states with coordinating agencies are much more apprehensive about increasing the authority and responsibilities of the general statewide agency than are the presidents in governing board states.

Among the presidents in favor of concentrating administration in the governing and coordinating agencies, several add comments which reveal the basis for their opinions. One president says that such concentration "would lead to more consistent requirements, standards, interpretations and awards." Another believes that "consolidation would expedite each institution's dealing with these particular programs," and a public institution president favors consolidation because it "would strengthen the commission." Several of the presidents opposed to a concentration of administrative responsibility for the federal programs comment that "some state agencies are better informed for particular programs than others"; that their coordinating agency "has no stature" or is "too political and too unstable"; and that the programs should not be given to the coordinating agency "as now constituted." A president of a major state university may well have expressed the approach of a number of his colleagues in saying:

> Value judgments are involved re several of the questions in this questionnaire touching on the desirability of assigning unified responsibility to the state's governing or coordinating board. It is difficult to separate the function of an office and the incumbent. If one has an enlightened incumbent, it is easier to allow larger responsibility to the office, otherwise not. In our replies, we have generally proceeded on the hypothesis that the incumbent at the state level will be intelligent and enlightened even though currently we may have our misgivings.

Quite apparently, the answers of many of the presidents to this question reflect their attitude toward state coordination in general and their assessment of the personnel and the performance of their governing or coordinating agencies, especially the latter.

Opinions of Governors

Although a majority of the presidents oppose consolidation of the administration of the federal programs in the states' governing and coordinating agencies, the governors as a group believe that such a consolidation would enhance state planning and coordination of higher education. Fourteen governors express this opinion without qualification and four others express the same opinion but add that "the involvement of private institutions makes other arrangements more acceptable." Only three governors respond negatively, six governors indicate that their states do not have a governing or coordinating agency, and two state that the coordinating agency administers all programs.

Table 9

PRESIDENTS' OPINIONS ON CONSOLIDATION OF
FEDERAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Question: If in your state the several state-coordinated federal programs are not all administered by the state's governing or coordinating board or agency, would you favor consolidating administration of all these programs in that agency?

Answers of Presidents

Type of Coordination	Yes		No		Makes No Difference	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Governing Board	5	4	6	0	6	2
Coordinating Agency	12	7	17	11	2	0
State Board of Education	2	0	1	1	2	0
	19	11	24	12	10	2
	(30)		(36)		(12)	

TOTAL 78

Question not applicable either because state does not have a governing or coordinating agency or the agency administers all the federal programs--41.

Answers not counted because they should have been "not applicable" responses--15.

Public presidents giving "other" responses--4.

Total answering--138.

Opinions of Special Agencies and Institutions

When the self-interest of the special agencies and the institutions charged with the responsibility for administering the state-coordinated federal programs is considered, it is not surprising that very few favor transfer of the administration of the programs for which they are responsible to the state's governing or coordinating agency. Only three of the special agencies administering Title I, HEFA and Title VI A HEA; only one of the agencies administering Title I, HEA; and none of the agencies or institutions administering the State Technical Services Act favor such a transfer of administrative responsibility.

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on Relationship of Statewide Governing or Coordinating Agency With State Government

In examining the impact of the state-coordinated federal programs on the statewide governing board or coordinating agency, another area which was explored was the possible effect that responsibility for administration of any of the state-coordinated federal programs might have had on the statewide agency's relationship with state government. Table 10 presents an analysis of the responses to this question received from nineteen of the twenty-three governing and coordinating agencies responsible for one or more of the federal programs. Two-thirds of the agencies responding do not believe that their responsibility for federal programs has affected their relationships with state government. Comments of five of the six respondents who do see an effect assess the effect as favorable, i.e., as strengthening the role of the agency or bringing about closer working relationships with other state agencies. One conclusion which can be drawn from this analysis is that the state-coordinated federal programs apparently have had a greater impact on the relationship of the coordinating agencies to state government than is the case for governing boards or state boards of education.

Summary of Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on the Statewide Governing or Coordinating Agencies

Although significant changes have occurred in fourteen of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies since 1962, only in a few states is there opinion that the state-coordinated federal programs have been an appreciable contributing factor in these changes. However, seventeen of these statewide agencies and ten of the governors in states in which such agencies have responsibility for the administration of one or more of these federal programs believe that this added authority has tended to strengthen the influence, standing or stability of the agencies. In the four states which established coordinating agencies between 1963 and 1967, some presidents believe that, at least to some extent, the state-coordinated federal programs were a contributing factor.

Table 10

EFFECT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES ON RELATIONSHIP OF AGENCY TO STATE GOVERNMENT

Question: Has the responsibility for the administration of any of the state-coordinated federal programs by the state coordinating agency affected the relationship of that agency to the state government, or any department or agency thereof?

Responses of Agencies Administering One or More Programs

Type of Agency	Yes	To Some Extent	No	Agencies Involved
Governing Board	0	0	5	7
Coordinating Agency	3	2	7	13
State Board of Education	0	1	1	3
Totals	3	3	13	23

Most of the statewide agencies with administrative responsibility for some of the state-coordinated federal programs feel that this responsibility has aided them in carrying out their general responsibility for planning and coordination of higher education. Proportionately, more of the coordinating agencies assess this aid as being materially helpful than do the statewide governing boards and the state boards of education.

In states in which the responsibility for administering two or more of these federal programs has been assigned to agencies or institutions other than the governing or coordinating agencies, a significant number of these statewide agencies, especially the coordinating agencies, believe that this dispersal of responsibility has, at least to some extent, adversely affected their planning and coordinating efforts. The special agencies and institutions given the responsibility for administration of state-coordinated federal programs oppose the consolidation of these programs in the governing and coordinating agencies, but fourteen of the twenty-four governors of states in which administration of the program is dispersed believe that consolidation of all programs in their statewide agencies would enhance state planning and coordination. The institutional presidents in these states are more evenly divided in their opinions on the question of this concentration of administrative responsibility. Although a majority of both the public and private presidents (a majority of only one in the latter group) expressing a definite opinion oppose consolidation of all the state-coordinated federal programs in their governing and coordinating agencies, a sizeable number (approximately fifteen percent of the respondents) are of the opinion that such consolidation would make no significant difference to them. The presidents in governing board states, especially the private institution presidents, either generally favor consolidation or are not opposed to it. In contrast to this generally favorable attitude, a majority of the presidents in coordinating board states oppose the concentration of administrative authority for all the federal programs in their coordinating agency. Undoubtedly, the reactions of many of these presidents are related to their opinion of state coordination and to their assessment of the performance of their coordinating agencies.

The statewide governing boards responsible for one or more of the four federal programs do not see that their administration of these programs has affected to any material extent their relationship with state government but a substantial proportion of the coordinating agencies administering the programs believe that this responsibility has improved, at least to some extent, this relationship.

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on the Planning and Coordinating Functions of the States

General Impact

To this point the impact of state-coordinated federal programs on the statewide governing and coordinating agencies has been examined. An evaluation of the impact of these programs on the state planning and coordinating functions, whether the federal programs are administered by the statewide governing and coordinating agencies or by other state agencies or institutions, is of equal importance.

Opinions of Governing and Coordinating Agencies

The governing and coordinating agencies were asked if any of the state-coordinated federal programs, however administered, has been effective in aiding or encouraging state efforts directed to the planning or coordination of higher education. Three of the state boards of education with responsibility for higher education, five statewide governing boards and sixteen coordinating agencies, a total of twenty-four agencies, answer in the affirmative. Three coordinating agencies and one governing board give negative responses. The agencies responding affirmatively were asked to designate the program or programs providing significant aid to their planning and coordinating efforts. The undergraduate facilities program under Title I, HEFA is mentioned by fifteen agencies, Title I, HEA by two, and the State Technical Services Act by one. Nine of the agencies naming the undergraduate facilities program specifically emphasize the importance of the planning grants made available under the 1966 amendment to that program.

When the reverse of the above query was propounded and the agencies were asked if any of the state-coordinated federal programs, however administered, had impeded to any material extent state efforts at planning and coordination, two coordinating agencies answer "yes," but sixteen other coordinating agencies, seven statewide governing boards and three state boards of education express a negative opinion. One of the two coordinating agencies answering in the affirmative refers to a temporary impediment which has been corrected. The other coordinating agency explains its answer by the basic criticism that "pressure for federal funds frequently lends to policy decisions not compatible with State Level Master Planning."

Opinions of Governors

The opinions of the state governors on the question of the nature of the impact of the state-coordinated federal programs on state planning and coordination of higher education can be presented most succinctly by listing the optional choices given them in the questionnaire and recording the number of responses. Each governor was asked to check one or more of the following:

a. These programs have had no material effect--2

b. They have created or contributed to an environment conducive to statewide master planning and coordination--29

c. They have influenced to some extent plans to establish a state coordinating agency--3

d. They have influenced to some extent plans to strengthen or expand the authority of the existing coordinating agency--11

e. The administration of some or all of these programs by the state's coordinating agency has tended to give that agency greater stability or stature--12

f. Activities of the statewide advisory committees for those programs have enhanced broad consideration of statewide educational problems and opportunities--21

g. These programs have increased the availability and dissemination of comparable information or statistical data--18

h. Other: "Indirectly, these programs have tended to show all educational institutions (public and private) that there has to be some central coordination of activities in the field of higher education"--1.

In addition, the governors were asked for specific instances in which federal programs have enhanced state planning and coordination. The specific instances mentioned and the number of governors giving each response are as follows:

Facilities planning--10

Development of comparable data--4

Improved state planning--4

Program planning--3

Increased contacts between public and private institutions--2

Student financial aid program--1

Technical services information system--1

Additional staff for coordinating board--1

This question was deficient in that it did not provide a specific optional choice to record a negative reaction. It did provide an "other" blank in which any negative opinion could have been expressed, but this did not eliminate entirely the bias of the question toward a favorable response. Although few, if any, negative reactions would have been anticipated, the absence of such an option does affect to some extent the significance of the otherwise pronounced favorable assessment by the governors.

Opinions of Institutional Presidents

The replies of the college and university presidents do not reflect the same degree of consensus as that evidenced by the governors and by the statewide governing and coordinating agencies in regard to the effect of state-coordinated federal programs on state planning and coordination of higher education. Although a substantial majority of the presidents responding did find some affirmative contributions by the federal programs

Table 11

EFFECTS OF STATE-COORDINATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON STATE PLANNING

Question: What general or specific effects have the state-coordinated federal programs had on state planning and coordination of higher education in your state? Check one or more of the following if appropriate:

Public Institution Presidents

Type of Coordination	(1)[a]	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Voluntary	0	1	1	0	0	1
Governing Board	4	5	7	6	2	1
Coordinating Agency	1	12	21	11	16	4
State Board of Education	0	4	4	0	1	0
No Formal	0	6	6	7	2	1
Total opinions expressed	5	28	39	24	21	7
Number of presidents responding	33		57			90

Private Institution Presidents

Type of Coordination	(1)[a]	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Voluntary	0	1	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	2	0	4	4	1	1
Coordinating Agency	3	7	11	11	11	0
State Board of Education	0	0	4	2	2	1
No Formal	1	4	3	0	2	0
Total opinions expressed	6	12	22	17	16	2
Number of presidents responding	18		36			54
Total opinions expressed	11	40	61	41	37	9
Total number of presidents responding	51		93			144

---

[a] (1) No effect; (2) No material effect; (3) Created or contributed to an environment conducive to statewide planning; (4) Activities of advisory committees have enhanced broad consideration of statewide educational problems and opportunities; (5) Increased availability and dissimination of comparable information on statistifal data; (6) Other.

to state planning and coordination, a few indicate certain negative effects and slightly more than one-third of the presidents believe that the state-coordinated federal programs either have had no effect or no material effect upon these state functions. Table 11 records the presidents' responses.

The presidents' answers indicating their opinions as to the contributions to state planning and coordination by the state-coordinated federal programs follow the same order of importance as those expressed by the governors. As separate groups, the opinions of the public presidents and the private presidents vary only slightly from those of the total group. Moreover, analysis of the responses of all presidents by type of state coordination does not show substantial differences in opinion between the presidents under the three forms of coordinating organizations. However, when the responses of the public and private presidents are analyzed separately by type of coordination, some marked differences are revealed but their significance is questionable in view of the small numbers included in most of these sub-categories.

Table 12

PRESIDENTS INDICATING SOME CONTRIBUTION
TO STATE PLANNING AND COORDINATION

	Percentage of All Presidents	Percentage of Public Presidents	Percentage of Private Presidents
Governing Board States	60%	55%	75%
Coordinating Board States	67	67	67
State Board of Education States	70	50	100
States With No Formal Coordination	56	63	44

Since in the states without formal coordinating bodies, the special agencies created to administer the federal programs, especially the facilities program, provide statewide organizations with some planning and coordinating authority and the programs, however administered, provide for state planning and coordination in limited areas, the percentage of presidents, especially the private presidents, finding some contribution by the federal programs to state planning and coordination is surprisingly small. The fact that a larger proportion of private presidents than public presidents in governing board and state board of education states recognize contributions to state planning and coordination probably relates to the inclusion of private institutions in state plans and their representation on state agencies and advisory committees--factors which are new to them but not to the state institutions.*

As this question to the presidents was structured (see Table 11 or Question 11 in Questionnaire C in the Appendix) with only effects favorable to state planning and coordination listed, some degree of bias was introduced. Those who believe that the federal programs have affected state planning and coordination adversely were limited to expressing their opinions under the "other" category of the question--as a few did. If appropriate negative effects had been included among the optional answers, perhaps more of the presidents, especially those who chose the "no effect" or "no material effect" options, would have indicated some negative impact.

Eight of the nine answers in Table 11 tabulated in the "Other" column are quoted below because of the implications, some negative, of several of the answers:

1. Has forced state to greater awareness of private institutions and their roles.
2. Facilities statistics are provided by comprehensive planning inventory data.
3. Dispersion of state plans in various state offices has made it more difficult for the institutions and has necessitated additional time and effort.

---

*A further analysis was made by breaking down the responses of the public and private presidents for each of the three categories of coordinating agencies based on whether the general coordinating agency or a separate agency administers the facilities programs. Among the governing board states only three of these agencies administer the facilities programs, and in these states all of the presidents responding believe that the federal programs have contributed to state planning and coordination. The presidents in the other governing board states are almost equally divided between those who see no effect and those who do. Among the coordinating board states, approximately a two-to-one majority of the public presidents indicate affirmative contributions whether the board or a separate agency administers the facilities programs; but eighty percent of the private presidents in states where the board is the administering agency find contributions to state planning and coordination, compared to an equal division among private presidents in states where a separate agency administers the facilities programs. The significance of these figures is limited by the small numbers involved in these sub-categories.

4. Have increased political discussion of cooperation.
5. Federal programs used to strengthen power of Board over the institution.
6. Planning money under Facilities Act going to the coordinating agency has further built the power of that agency at the expense of the statewide governing board.
7. Changed the state structure for higher education.
8. Federal programs have eroded state prerogatives to create and modify the governmental structure of higher education. Program plans are really federal and not state; what is needed is greater flexibility at state level in determining plans and in administration of programs.

Five of these replies are critical of different aspects of the federal programs. Answer number five either complains of a misuse by the coordinating agency of the power incident to the responsibility for administration of the federal programs or, more likely, objects to the concept of state coordination and administration for these programs because it is viewed as the basis for further erosion of institutional autonomy. The last answer in the list, in part, is critical of the degree of federal control over the programs and, in part, is critical of the federal requirements which constrain the state's choice of agencies to administer the programs; and answers three, six and seven complain of the choices of administrative agencies made by their states and of the consequences to the institutions and to the state structure.

Thirty-six of the presidents whose answers are tabulated in Table 11 provide examples of areas or activities in which state coordination has been enhanced by these state-coordinated federal programs. The examples are so varied as to make impossible any meaningful categorization but it is possible to isolate two general areas of emphasis. One area relates to the favorable impact on, and the impetus given to, facilities planning. Many more of the examples relate to some aspect of this area than to any other. The other area of emphasis relates to the involvement of private institutions, with only one answer being specifically critical of the failure to include the private sector in state planning.

The effect of each of the state-coordinated federal programs on state planning and coordination as viewed by the state agencies responsible for their administration is developed in Chapter 2, and in the summary of that chapter the relative impact of the programs is compared. For the effect of these programs refer to pages 30 to 32 for the facilities programs, to pages 38 to 40 for the community service program and to pages 49 to 50 for the technical services programs. The summary begins on page 51.

Summary of the Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs on State Planning and Coordination

The material presented in this section can be rather succinctly summarized. A preponderant majority of the governing and coordinating agencies, the special agencies administering the facilities and equipment programs, and the governors believe that the state-coordinated federal programs have enhanced in various ways state planning and coordination of higher education. A somewhat smaller but still substantial majority of college and university presidents are in accord, with approximately the same proportion of the private presidents as the public presidents holding this view. A few of the presidents are critical of certain aspects and effects of the state-coordinated programs. The undergraduate facilities program, both because of the substantial level of funding and because of the facilities planning grants, has had far more impact on state planning and coordination than have the other programs. The community service and continuing education program, because of its very much lower level of funding, because it involves an area less central to the mainstream of institutional operation, and because it is administered in about half of the states by institutions has had substantially less effect than the facilities program. Of least impact on state planning and coordination is the State Technical Services Act, an inadequately funded program designed not to aid higher education but to use institutions of higher education to aid industry.

Impact of State-Coordinated Federal Programs On Relationship Between Public and Private Institutions

Opinions of the Governing and Coordinating Agencies

An attempt was made to determine whether the state-coordinated federal programs have had any impact on the relationships between public and private institutions in the states. Twenty of the twenty-three statewide governing and coordinating agencies with responsibility for one or more of these federal programs responded to the question directed to this point. Eleven of the agencies believe that their administration of the federal programs has not affected to any discernable extent the relationship between the public and private institutions but nine believe that it has, and that the effect has been to improve or enhance this relationship.

A majority of the governing boards and of the state boards of education administering at least one of the federal programs do not see that this responsibility has affected the public-private relationship, but a majority of the coordinating agencies believe that their administration of these programs has affected favorably the relationships between the two sectors.

Opinions of Presidents

Almost sixty percent of the presidents do not believe that administration of federal programs by state agencies under state plans has had any appreciable effect on the relationship or extent of cooperation between the public and private institutions. A slightly larger percentage of the private presidents than of the public presidents express this opinion.

As shown in Table 13, all but one of the thirteen presidents in the four state board of education states believe that the state-coordinated federal programs have not had any effect on the public-private relationship, and seventy percent or more of both groups of presidents in states without formal coordinating organizations share this opinion. In the governing board and coordinating board states a number of presidents are undecided and, except for the private presidents in the governing board states, the others are closely divided in their views on this question. In no instance, however, is there a majority opinion that the relationships between the public and private sectors have been affected appreciably by the state administration of these federal programs.

Table 13

EFFECTS OF FEDERAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION ON COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Question: Has the administration of these federal programs by a state agency under a state plan affected to any discernable extent the relationship or extent of cooperation between the public and private institutions in the state?

Presidents' Responses

Type of Coordination	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Voluntary	1	0	1	1	0	0
Governing Board	12	2	12	7	4	1
Coordinating Agency	14	12	19	12	4	2
State Board of Education	1	0	7	5	0	0
No Formal	5	2	12	6	0	0
	33	16	51	31	8	3
	49		82		11 (142)	

The comments of both the agencies and the presidents whose responses indicate that state administration of the federal programs has had an impact on the public-private relationship tend to emphasize three factors: (1) the importance of the representation of the private sector on advisory groups; (2) the involvement of private institutions in state planning; and (3) the increased personal contacts between administrators in the two sectors resulting in increased exchange of information, greater awareness of common problems and better understanding of separate interests and roles. Most of the respondents who give a reason for their opinion that the federal programs have not had an effect on the relationship between public and private institutions stress the already existing good relationship between the two sectors in their state.

Reaction of Institutions to State-Coordination of Federal Programs

The reaction of the institutions to the concept of state-coordination for federal programs was considered to be an important consideration in the overall assessment of the impact of federal programs. To make an evaluation of the effect of these programs on state planning and coordination of higher education without giving consideration to the opinions of institutional representatives would be to ignore a determining factor in the long-range success or failure of the concept of state coordination, for it is the educational institutions, not federal programs or state agencies, that implement educational functions. If the institutions of higher education were generally to oppose state coordination, objectives of the programs could not be fully attained and state planning and coordination would be more difficult. If the institutions are largely supportive of state coordination, program objectives can be more fully realized and state planning and coordination can be more effective.

In this section the reactions of the presidents to state coordination of the four federal programs under study are examined, and their reactions are found to be predominantly favorable. In subsequent sections, the preferences of the presidents for state coordination as opposed to direct implementation of these federal programs and their reactions to the expansion of state coordination to other programs will be explored.

Reaction of Presidents to Concept of State Coordination for the Four Federal Programs

Table 14 analyzes the responses from the public institution presidents giving their reactions to the concept of state coordination as applied to the four federal programs under review. Table 15 makes the same analysis of the responses from the presidents of private institutions.

Slightly more than two-thirds of the public presidents who express an opinion indicate that the reaction of the public institutions in their

Table 14

REACTION OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS TO CONSOLIDATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Question: What has been the reaction of the public institutions of higher education in the state to the administration of these federal programs by a state agency or institution under a state plan rather than direct negotiation by each institution with the federal agency at all stages of its request?

Responses of Presidents of Public Institutions

Type of Coordination	General Approval	General Disapproval	Doubt and Apprehension	Qualified General Approval[a]	Don't Know
Voluntary	3	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	17	0	3	2	1
Coord. Agency	25	0	10	2	2
State Bd. of Educ.	3	0	1	2	0
No Formal	11	0	3	1	0
	59	0	17	7	3

[a] Approved generally but with institutional exceptions.

"Other" answers generally favorable in tone--2

Total responses--88.

Table 15

REACTION OF PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS TO CONSOLIDATED FEDERAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Question: What has been the reaction of the private institutions of higher education in the state to the administration of these federal programs by a state agency or institution under a state plan rather than direct negotiation by each institution with the federal agency at all stages of its request?

Responses of Presidents of Private Institutions

Type of Coordination	General Approval	General Disapproval	Doubt and Apprehension	Qualified General Approval[a]	Don't Know
Voluntary	1	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	6	0	0	0	2
Coord. Agency	14	0	9	1	1
State Bd. of Educ.	3	0	2	0	1
No Formal	4	0	3	2	1
	28	0	14	3	5

---

[a] Approved generally but with institutional exceptions.

"Other" answers generally favorable in tone--2.

Total Responses--50.

state is one of general approval of the concept of state coordination, and an additional nine percent believe that there is general approval but with one or more institutional exceptions in the state. Not a single president believes that there is any general disapproval of state coordination for the federal programs and only twenty percent believe that there is some degree of doubt and apprehension among public institution presidents concerning state coordination of the programs.

The opinions of the presidents of private institutions regarding the reaction of private institutions to state coordination of federal programs are substantially the same as the reactions in the public sector. Sixty percent believe that there is general approval of the concept and a few others believe this to be the general reaction but with one or more institutional exceptions within the state. As is true in the case of the public institution presidents, not a single private institution president believes that there is any general disapproval of state coordination, and only about one-fourth feel that in their states there is some degree of doubt and apprehension in the private sector concerning the administrative role of the state. The two tables show a marked contrast between the number of presidents in states with coordinating agencies who express doubt about state coordination of federal programs and the very small number of presidents in states with governing boards who have such apprehensions. Responses from thirty-two governors indicate that only two are aware of any serious objections by private institutions to the state-coordinated federal programs.

Reaction of the Presidents to the State Plans and Administration of the State-Coordinated Federal Programs

This highly favorable general reaction to state coordination is supplemented by an even more favorable reaction of public and private presidents to the state plans and the state administration of each of the four federal programs. When asked if they were reasonably satisfied with the state plans for the undergraduate facilities program, the undergraduate equipment program, the community service and continuing education program, and the technical services program, the affirmative responses of the public college and university presidents vary from about eighty percent for the technical services program, to approximately ninety percent for the facilities program. With regard to their reasonable satisfaction with the administration of the state plans by state agencies, the affirmative responses of these presidents vary from eighty-five percent for the technical services program and the community services program to just over ninety percent for the facilities program.

Surprisingly, there is an even greater expression of approval on the part of the presidents of private institutions. Their reasonable satisfaction with the state plans varies from just under ninety percent for the technical services program to almost ninety-five percent for the facilities program; and their reasonable satisfaction with the administration of these programs runs from just under ninety percent for the community ser-

Table 16

SATISFACTION OF PRESIDENTS WITH APPROVED STATE PLANS FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Question: Are you reasonably satisfied with the state plans which have been approved for the listed state-coordinated federal programs?

Responses of Public Institution Presidents

Type of Coordination	Title I, HEFA		Title VIA, HEA		Title I, HEA		Tech. Ser.	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voluntary	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	21	1	20	2	18	5	17	6
Coord. Agency	36	7	37	6	35	6	31	7
State Bd. of Educ.	8	0	6	2	6	2	7	1
No Formal	17	0	15	2	15	1	14	2
Total Public Pres.	85	8	81	12	74	14	69	16
	(93)		(93)		(88)		(85)	

Responses of Private Institution Presidents

Type of Coordination	Title I, HEFA		Title VIA HEA		Title I, HEA		Tech. Ser.	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voluntary	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	7	0	7	0	8	0	5	1
Coord. Agency	23	2	22	3	16	3	13	2
State Bd. of Educ.	6	0	5	1	6	0	5	1
No Formal	10	0	9	1	9	1	9	0
Total Private Pres.	47	2	44	5	39	4	32	4
	(49)		(49)		(43)		(36)	
Total Presidents	132	10	125	17	113	18	101	20
	(142)		(142)		(131)		(121)	

Table 17

SATISFACTION OF PRESIDENTS WITH ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Question: Are you reasonably satisfied with the administration of the state plans for these federal programs by the designated state agencies or institutions?

Responses of Public Institution Presidents

Type of Coordination	Title I, HEFA		Title VIA, HEA		Title I, HEA		Tech. Ser.	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voluntary	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	22	0	20	2	20	3	18	4
Coord. Agency	35	6	36	5	33	5	30	5
State Bd. of Educ.	7	1	7	1	5	3	8	0
No Formal	16	1	16	1	14	2	13	3
Total Public Pres.	83	8	82	9	72	13	69	12
	(91)		(91)		(85)		(81)	

Responses of Private Institution Presidents

Type of Coordination	Title I, HEFA		Title VIA, HEA		Title I, HEA		Tech. Ser.	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voluntary	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	8	0	8	0	7	0	6	0
Coord. Agency	24	1	24	1	18	4	15	1
State Bd. of Educ.	5	1	6	0	6	0	5	1
No Formal	9	1	9	1	8	1	8	0
Total Private Pres.	47	3	48	2	39	5	34	2
	(50)		(50)		(44)		(36)	
Total Presidents	130	11	130	11	111	18	103	14
	(141)		(141)		(129)		(117)	

vice and continuing education program to ninety-six percent for the undergraduate equipment program.

The various reasons given by presidents for their feelings of dissatisfaction toward state plans and administration generally can be summarized as follows:

> Regarding state plans: they are too objective, lack criteria based on quality, lack flexibility at the state level to meet state needs, do not adequately reflect institutional differences, favor small colleges, emphasize criteria which put private institutions at a disadvantage, are too complex because of federal requirements, and because they are based on object of expense, they emphasize means and not the ends of education.
>
> Regarding state administration: the programs merely add another administrative layer, and the staffs of the state agencies lack the necessary expertise or understanding.

Broad institutional approval for state administration of each of the four federal programs is further evidenced by the assessment of institutional opinion made by the state agencies responsible for the administration of each of these programs. With but few exceptions, the state administrative agencies for each program interpret the reactions of both the public and private institutions to state coordination of the programs as favorable.

Reaction of the Presidents to the State Plans as Providing Equitably for Interests of Public and Private Institutions

Not only do very substantial majorities of both public and private presidents express reasonable satisfaction with the state plans and the administration of the state-coordinated federal programs, but also a preponderant number of each group (see Table 18 below) believe that the state plans for all four programs provide equitably for the interests of the public and private sectors of higher education in their states. The presidents in two states comment that in their states the state plans for the facilities program were purposely designed, with concurrance of the public sector, to favor the private institution. The few explanations given by other presidents for their indications of favoritism generally refer to the "quantity" versus "quality" emphasis of the point system for determining priorities under the facilities and equipment programs, and a few

Table 18

EQUITABILITY OF STATE PLANS FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

Question: Have the state plans for these state-coordinated federal programs provided equitably for the interests of the private and public sectors of higher education in your state?

Responses of Presidents

Type of Institution	Title I, HEFA Yes	Title I, HEFA Favors Public	Title I, HEFA Favors Private	Title VI A, HEA Yes	Title VI A, HEA Favors Public	Title VI A, HEA Favors Private	Title I, HEA Yes	Title I, HEA Favors Public	Title I, HEA Favors Private	Technical Services Yes	Technical Services Favors Public	Technical Services Favors Private
Public	80	3	11	90	1	3	86	3	0	82	5	1
Private	37	9	4	42	6	2	38	6	0	30	7	0
Totals	117	12	15	132	7	5	124	9	0	112	12	1

private presidents believe that administration of the community service and technical services programs by state institutions puts the private institutions at some disadvantage.

Summary of Institutional Reactions to State Coordination of the Four Federal Programs

Substantial majorities of both the public and private presidents believe that their sectors of higher education give general approval to the concept of state-coordination as applied to the four federal programs under review. Although approximately twenty percent of the public presidents and twenty-five percent of the private institution presidents feel that there is some doubt and apprehension in their respective sectors concerning the concept of state-coordination, the fact that not one president, private or public, believes that there is general disapproval of state coordination is an important factor in the general assessment of the impact of these federal programs. Proportionately, more of the public and private presidents in states with coordinating agencies believe that there is apprehension concerning state coordination of the programs than presidents in states with statewide governing boards.

A great preponderance of the presidents indicate that they are reasonably satisfied with both the state plans and the administration of the state-coordinated federal programs. This favorable assessment is proportionately somewhat greater in the private institution group than among the presidents of public institutions. The great majority of both groups of presidents also believe that the state plans for the four programs have provided equitably for the interests of the public and private sectors of higher education.

Impact of Federal Programs Implemented Directly With Institutions

Previous sections of the study reflect a favorable assessment of the impact of the state-coordinated federal programs on state planning and coordination by both governors and the general coordinating agencies, but also of importance to the overall evaluation of the impact of federal programs is their assessment of the effect on state planning and coordination of the programs implemented directly between the federal agencies and the institutions.

Opinions of the Governors

The governors were asked whether the direct federal programs had caused substantial problems in state planning and coordination of higher education. The affirmative and negative responses of the governors to this query, tabulated in Table 19, reveal a quite even division of opinion among the governors both as a group and within the several sub-groups based on type of coordination. Four of the governors responded in the affirmative to the query but added the qualification that the problems had not been substantial. Under the specific wording of the question, these four responses could very appropriately be classified as "no" answers, thereby changing somewhat both the results and their implications. What is important is that more of the governors responding do not see the direct federal programs as causing substantial problems for state planning and coordination than those that do.

Table 19

GOVERNORS' VIEWS OF PROBLEMS DUE TO PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED DIRECTLY BY INSTITUTIONS

Question: Do the many federal programs in higher education which are negotiated and administered directly with the institutions cause substantial problems in state planning and coordination of higher education?

	Responses of Governors			
Type of Coordination	Yes	No	Other	No Answer
Governing Board	3	4	1	1
Coordinating Agency	8(2)[a]	6	0	3
State Board of Education	1	1	0	1
No Formal	4(2)[a]	3	0	0
Totals	16(4)[a]	14	1	5

[a] Gave "yes" answer but indicated "not substantial."

The comments of governors who do see the direct federal programs as creating problems for the state emphasize three areas of concern: (1) the existence of substantial funds in the hands of the institutions for which they are not directly accountable to state government; (2) institutional initiation of programs committing the state to provide matching funds or to maintain with state funds increased support levels established by federal funds; and (3) federal support of institutional programs or facilities which may not be consistent with state planning. A few states have attempted to minimize the latter two problems by requiring the institutions to clear proposals to federal agencies which are above a certain amount with a state agency or office. Some presidents in two states where this procedure is established object strongly and give as their reasons the infringement upon institutional autonomy, the delay and red tape involved, and the lack of expertise or understanding at the state level to make appropriate judgements.

Opinions of Governing and Coordinating Agencies

To ascertain the opinions of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies regarding the impact of direct federal programs on state planning and coordination, these agencies were asked for their general reactions and for their specific assessment of the impact of specific types of programs. On the question of whether the categorical and programmatic basis for direct federal programs had made effective coordination more difficult, the agencies, as shown in Table 20, are about equally divided. Although twelve do not believe that coordination has been made more difficult, thirteen believe that it has, at least to some extent. Here again, a distinct difference between the opinions of governing boards and of coordinating agencies is revealed. As Table 20 indicates, whereas only one of the seven governing boards responding had found that the direct federal programs have caused difficulties in coordination, eleven of the fifteen affected coordinating agencies responding believe that effective coordination has been made more difficult, but six of the eleven indicate that this has been the effect only "to some extent."

Table 20

DIFFICULTIES FOR AGENCIES DUE TO CATEGORICAL
BASIS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Question: Has the categorical or programmatic basis of most federal grants programs providing support to qualifying institutions made more difficult the effective coordination of higher education by the state coordinating agency?

	Responses of Agencies				
Type of Coordination	Yes	To some extent	No	Other	No Answer
Governing Boards	1	0	6	0	2
Coordinating Agencies	5	6	4	4[a]	1
State Boards of Education	0	1	2	0	0
Totals	6	7	12	4	3

[a] Three agencies answered "not applicable" because their authority is advisory only.

This difference in assessment is another reflection of the difference between the authority and role of a statewide governing body and of a state agency having only coordinating responsibility. This difference of opinion between these two types of agencies does not exist to the same extent, however in their assessment of the impact of direct federal programs in specific situations. Four questions relating to certain programs or to certain circumstances were posed and the responses to these questions are summarized in Tables 21 to 24. Almost all of the statewide agencies are of the opinion that they have not been constrained in their choice of action on institutional requests for approval of graduate programs by previous direct federal grants to the institutions. And only one agency reports that a federal grant has been made to an institution for a program not authorized by the agency, where agency approval of institutional programs is required. Moreover, in only four states do the state agencies, all coordinating agencies, believe that federal funding to any institution has reached a level which makes difficult the effective coordination of the activities of that institution as part of the state system. A somewhat different reaction, however, exists regarding the impact of the various planning programs under the Public Health Services Act. Twelve of the twenty-five agencies who responded believe that these direct programs have had some effect on state planning and coordination in their states, but only six of the twelve indicate whether that impact has been favorable or unfavorable. Although four of these six replies assess the effect as unfavorable, the limited number of descriptive responses does not provide a basis for any valid generalizations.

Table 21

CONSTRAINT ON CHOICE OF ACTION OF STATE AGENCY DUE TO PREVIOUS GRANTS

Question: Specifically, have federal grants to one of your institutions for a graduate facility, a research program, a major item of research equipment, or a teaching or research institute constrained to any appreciable extent the choice of action by the state coordinating agency on a subsequent request by that institution for approval of a graduate academic program?

Responses of Agencies

Type of Coordination	Yes	No	State agency does not approve new programs	No Answer
Governing Board	0	7	0	2
Coordinating Agency	2	13	5	0
State Board of Ed.	1	2	0	0
Totals	3	22	5	2

Table 22

INSTANCES OF GRANTS OR LOANS UNAUTHORIZED BY STATE AGENCY

Question: In your state have there been any instances of federal grants or loans to state institutions (under the Facilities Act or from NSF, NIH or other federal agencies) for construction of facilities for degree or research programs not authorized for the particular institution by the state coordinating agency, where such approval is required by state law?

Responses of Agencies

Type of Coordination	Yes	No	Question not applicable in my state	No answer
Governing Board	0	5	3[a]	1
Coordinating Agency	1	12	7[a]	0
State Board of Ed.	0	3	0	0
Totals	1	20	10	1

[a] The choice of this response by the three governing boards and by one of the coordinating agencies is subject to question.

Table 23

IMPACT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT PROGRAMS ON STATE AGENCY PLANNING

Question: Have the several federal programs under the Public Health Service Act providing for planning in the field of health services and personnel had an impact on the planning and coordination of higher education in your state?

Responses of Agencies

Type of Coordination	Yes materially	To some extent	Not appreciably	No answer
Governing Board	0	4	1	4
Coordinating Agency	2	6	10	2
State Board of Ed.	0	0	3	0
Totals	2	10	14	6

Table 24

COORDINATION DIFFICULTY DUE TO LEVEL OF FEDERAL SUPPORT

Question: Has the amount of federal support from all sources received by any institution in your state reached a level which makes it difficult to coordinate effectively the activities of that institution as part of the state system of higher education?

Responses of Agencies

Type of Coordination	Yes	No	Other	No answer
Governing Board	0	7	0	2
Coordinating Agency	4	11	4[a]	1
State Board of Education	0	3	0	0
Totals	4	21	4	3

[a] Three agencies answered "not applicable" because their authority is advisory only.

Summary of Impact of Federal Programs Implemented Directly With the Institutions on State Planning and Coordination

Although a majority of the governors participating in the study express the opinion that the federal programs implemented directly with the institutions have not caused substantial difficulties for state planning and coordination of higher education in their states, a substantial number of governors believe that they have. Among the state governing and coordinating agencies there is an almost equal division of opinion on this question, with a majority (of one) of the agencies responding taking the position that the direct categorical grant programs have made effective coordination of higher education more difficult.

One objection to direct aid advanced by several governors, i.e., that federal funds may support institutional programs not consistent with state planning, does not find support in the responses of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies to certain specific situations involving this issue. Specifically, only three of the agencies have found their choice of action on an institutional request for approval of a graduate program constrained by a prior federal grant to the institution, and only one agency reports that an institutional facility grant had been made to an institution for a program not approved by the state agency. While these responses are not indicative of appreciable federal interference with state plans by direct grants to institutions, the specific queries cover only two areas of possible interference. Somewhat more, but still not substantial, interference is suggested as a result of planning grants to institutions under the Public Health Services Act. No specific investigation was made of the effect of programs in the undergraduate or professional education areas or as to the effect of departmental or institutional development grants on state plans.

The most serious objection made by some of the governors, and by state fiscal officers in several of the states where personal interviews were made, was to the commitment of future funding by the state inherent in many direct federal grants. These institutional commitments may relate to matching state funds for specific projects or programs, or to obligations to maintain with state funds levels of fiscal support established with federal funds. This objection is also made by several of the coordinating agencies which have budget reviewing responsibilities.

Institutional Preferences for State-Coordination or for Direct Institutional Negotiation in the Implementation of Existing State-Coordinated Federal Programs

As previously noted a very large majority of both public and private college and university presidents are reasonably satisfied with both the state plans and the administration of the present state-coordinated federal programs. To gauge the reactions of the presidents to a choice between state coordination and direct implementation for these existing programs, two additional questions were posed. First, the presidents were asked for their choice between the concepts of state coordination and direct institutional implementation solely from the viewpoint of the best interests of their own institutions. Then the presidents were asked whether they preferred state-coordination or whether they believed direct institutional implementation to be equal or better than state-coordination, taking into consideration not only the interests of their own institutions but also the Congressional purpose of each program, the interests of their states, and the common academic concerns of higher education. The responses to both questions are substantially the same.

Table 25

PRESIDENTS' VIEWS OF OWN INSTITUTIONS' INTERESTS BEING SERVED BY COORDINATED ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Question: From the viewpoint solely of the best interests of your own institution, do you favor the administration of these listed federal programs by state agencies or institutions under approved state plans, or would you prefer that these programs be implemented by the federal agencies directly with the individual institutions?

Type of Coordination	Public Institution Presidents				Total Public		Private Institution Presidents				Total Private	
	No Doctoral		Doctoral				No Doctoral		Doctoral			
	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct
Title I, HEFA, Undergraduate Facilities:												
Voluntary	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Gov. Bd.	4	2	12	3	16	5	6	0	1	1	7	1
Coord. Ag.	8	4	21	9	29	13	12	5	2	6	14	11
St. Bd. of Ed.	1	0	5	2	6	2	0	1	1	2	1	3
No Formal	9	0	5	2	14	2	6	1	0	2	6	3
	23	6	43	18	66	24	24	7	5	11	29	18

Total Responding - 137

Table 25 (Continued

Type of Coordination	Public Institution Presidents				Total Public		Private Institution Presidents				Total Private	
	No Doctoral		Doctoral				No Doctoral		Doctoral			
	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct
Title VI A:												
Voluntary	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Gov. Bd.	2	3	13	2	15	5	5	0	1	1	6	1
Coord. Ag.	9	3	18	11	27	14	12	6	2	6	14	12
St. Bd. of Ed.	1	1	4	2	5	3	1	1	1	3	2	4
No Formal	9	0	4	3	13	3	6	1	0	2	6	3
	22	7	39	20	61	27	24	8	5	12	29	20
Total Responding - 137												
Title I, HEA:												
Voluntary	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	4	1	14	2	18	3	5	0	1	1	6	1
Coord. Ag.	9	3	18	11	27	14	9	6	3	5	12	11
St. Bd. of Ed.	1	1	4	2	5	3	1	1	2	2	3	3
No Formal	9	0	4	3	13	3	6	1	0	2	6	3
	23	5	40	20	63	25	21	8	6	10	27	18
Total Responding - 133												

Table 25 (Continued)

Type of Coordination	Public Institution Presidents: No Doctoral: Prefer State	Public Institution Presidents: No Doctoral: Prefer Direct	Public Institution Presidents: Doctoral: Prefer State	Public Institution Presidents: Doctoral: Prefer Direct	Total Public: State	Total Public: Direct	Private Institution Presidents: No Doctoral: Prefer State	Private Institution Presidents: No Doctoral: Prefer Direct	Private Institution Presidents: Doctoral: Prefer State	Private Institution Presidents: Doctoral: Prefer Direct	Total Private: State	Total Private: Direct
Technical Services:												
Voluntary	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	4	0	12	4	16	4	4	0	1	1	5	1
Coord. Ag.	8	2	20	7	28	9	7	4	3	4	10	8
St. Bd. of Ed.	2	0	6	0	8	0	1	1	4	0	5	1
No Formal	8	0	5	2	13	2	6	0	0	2	6	2
	22	2	43	15	65	17	18	5	8	7	26	12

Total Responding - 120

Table 26

PRESIDENTS' VIEWS OF ALL INTERESTS BEING SERVED BY COORDINATED ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Question: On balance, taking into consideration the Congressional purpose of each program, the interests of the state, and the common academic concerns of higher education, as well as the interest of your institution as they relate to the other institutions in your state, are these varied interests better served by administration of these federal programs by state agencies under approved state plans or would these interests be equally or better served by the federal agencies dealing directly with individual institutions?

	Public Institution Presidents						Private Institution Presidents					
	No Doctoral		Doctoral		Total Public		No Doctoral		Doctoral		Total Private	
Type of Coordination	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct
Title I, HEFA:												
Voluntary	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Gov. Bd.	4	1	14	2	18	3	5	1	2	0	7	1
Coord. Ag.	8	4	19	8	27	12	14	4	3	6	17	10
St. Bd. of Ed.	1	1	5	1	6	2	2	0	1	3	3	3
No Formal	9	0	5	2	14	2	5	1	1	1	6	2
	23	6	43	15	66	21	26	6	8	10	34	16

Total Responding - 137

Table 26 (Continued)

Type of Coordination	Public Institution Presidents				Total Public		Private Institution Presidents				Total Private	
	No Doctoral		Doctoral				No Doctoral		Doctoral			
	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct
Title VIA, HEA:												
Voluntary	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Gov. Bd.	2	3	14	2	16	5	5	1	2	0	7	1
Coord. Ag.	8	4	18	9	26	13	14	5	3	6	17	11
St. Bd. of Ed.	2	0	4	2	6	2	2	0	1	3	3	3
No Formal	9	0	4	3	13	3	5	1	0	2	5	3
	22	7	40	18	62	25	26	7	7	11	33	18
Total Responding - 138												
Title I, HEA:												
Voluntary	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	5	0	14	2	19	2	5	1	2	0	7	1
Coord. Ag.	8	4	15	10	23	14	10	6	4	5	14	11
St. Bd. of Ed.	2	0	4	2	6	2	2	0	2	2	4	2
No Formal	9	0	4	2	13	2	6	0	1	1	7	1
	24	4	38	17	62	21	23	7	9	8	32	15
Total Responding - 130												

Table 26 (Continued)

Type of Coordination	Public Institution Presidents				Total Public		Private Institution Presidents				Total Private	
	No Doctoral		Doctoral				No Doctoral		Doctoral			
	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	State	Direct
Technical Services:												
Voluntary	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	4	0	12	3	16	3	4	1	2	0	6	1
Coord. Ag.	9	2	18	7	27	9	8	2	4	4	12	6
St. Bd. of Ed.	2	0	6	0	8	0	2	0	3	1	5	1
No Formal	8	0	4	2	12	2	4	0	0	2	4	2
	23	2	41	13	64	15	18	3	9	7	27	10

Total Responding - 116

Reactions of Public and Private Presidents Generally

Tables 25 and 26 show the responses of the presidents to these two questions broken down as between the public and private sectors and by the type of coordination. As a group, the presidents of public institutions, both from the institutional viewpoint alone and on the broader basis, express a preference for state coordination of all four of the programs. On the basis solely of institutional interests, this majority support for state coordination of each of the four programs varies between seventy and eighty percent of those responding. On the basis of the broader interests, the support for state coordination is slightly more for each of the programs.

As a group, the presidents of private institutions are only somewhat less emphatic in support of the principle of state coordination. On the basis of institutional interest only, the support for state coordination varies from sixty to seventy percent of those responding; and on the broader question, the support for state coordination is about the same for the technical services program and slightly more for the other three programs.

Because considerably fewer institutions are involved in the technical services program, the number of presidents expressing a preference regarding the handling of this program was somewhat less than the number who responded for the other three programs. Of those who do express a preference, a somewhat larger majority favor state coordination for this program than for the others. This is probably evidence of the wide recognition of the different nature and purpose of the State Technical Services Program, that its objective is to aid business and industry in the states by improving the transmission and communication of up-to-date technical information, and to this end to make use of the expertise which exists in our educational institutions. Because the program is not intended as a direct aid to education, it is regarded more as a state economic development program than as an educational program.

Reactions Based on Type of Coordination and Type of Institution

The considerably greater degree of support for state coordination of the four federal progams by presidents in governing board states compared to the support for this concept by presidents in coordinating board states is consistent with similar findings reported in previous sections. The support of state coordination by private presidents in the governing board states is almost unanimous, but it should be noted that almost all of the presidents responding are from institutions which do not have doctoral programs.

Further analysis of the responses of presidents in governing board and coordinating board states concerning the facilities program and the community service program based on whether the general state agency or a special agency or institution administers these programs provides some interesting results. For the governing board states, substantial majorities of the public and the private presidents prefer state coordination of the facilities program and the community service program, both in the states where the governing board administers the program (three states for each program) and in the states where a separate agency or institution is the administering agency. In the coordinating board states, however, the responses of the presidents differ for the two programs. For the facilities program, small majorities of both public and private presidents favor direct implementation where a separate agency administers the program, but a substantial majority of each group favors state coordination where the state coordinating agency administers the program. For the community service program, however, substantial majorities of both groups prefer state coordination where separate agencies or institutions administer the program, but where the program is administered by the general coordinating agency only a bare majority of public presidents prefer state coordination and a majority of the private presidents prefer direct implementation.

This analysis shows a consistent pattern of general support for state coordination by both public and private presidents in governing board states but presidents in the coordinating board states apparently view the facilities program and the community service program differently. For the facilities program, state coordination receives greater support where the coordinating agency administers the program but for the community service program, state coordination gets more support where separate agencies or institutions have administrative responsibility. This difference may arise from one or both of two factors: (1) the facilities program relates only to capital construction whereas the community service program concerns an operational program involving faculty time and effort, and (2) the facilities program is administered solely by state agencies but the community service program is administered by academic institutions in a large number of states.

Analysis of the responses based on the type of institution reveals substantial differences. A majority of the private presidents of doctoral-granting institutions favor direct implementation of all but the technical services program when their preference is based solely on institutional interests and of all but the community service program when broader considerations are involved. Although a substantial majority of the public presidents of doctoral-granting institutions prefer state coordination for each of the four programs, a larger percentage of this group favor direct implementation than do the public presidents of institutions without doctoral programs.

The greater degree of support for direct implementation by presidents of institutions with doctoral programs, particularly by presidents of private institutions, is not surprising. Perhaps what is more surprising is the number of presidents of major graduate institutions from both the private as well as public sectors who favor state coordination for some or all of these existing programs. Generally, these graduate institutions will have had greater involvement with direct federal-aid programs, will have staffs and facilities with closer connections in the federal agencies, and will consider themselves to be more closely related to the regional or national academic community and, therefore, will be more inclined to prefer national rather than state assessments of their proposals and requests. The president of one prestigeous university expressed the feelings of many presidents of similar institutions when he said "We are a national institution, competing on a national basis, and drawing our students from all sections of the country. We have much more in common with Washington than with this state. The fact that this institution is located in [state] is incidental and has no relationship to our purpose or mission." Probably the reason for the acceptance of state coordination for these four programs by many presidents of graduate institutions is the fact that these programs affect only undergraduate programs or other areas not integral to graduate teaching and research.

Summary of Presidents' Reactions

Quite substantial majorities of the public and private presidents as separate groups express support for state coordination of each of the four state-coordinated federal programs. Three different factors influence the opinions of the presidents: the type of coordination, the type of organization administering the programs, and the type of institution (*i.e.*, with doctoral programs or with no doctoral programs).

When the responses are analyzed on the basis of type of state coordination, the following observations and comparisons can be made:

(1) There is a considerably greater degree of support for state coordination for each of the four programs among both public and private institution presidents in states with statewide governing boards and in states with no formal coordination than there is among either of these groups in coordinating board or state board of education states. The one exception is the almost unanimous support for state coordination for the technical services program by presidents from state board of education states.

(2) There is almost unanimous support for state coordination for each of the programs by the private institution presidents in governing board states. Although the small number of respondents in this group reduces the significance of any conclusions which might otherwise be drawn

from the results, the fact that almost all of the responses are from institutions without doctoral programs tends to show that this factor rather than the type of coordination accounts for the opinions expressed.

(3) A majority of private institution presidents in state board of education states favor direct implementation of the facilities and undergraduate equipment programs but the sample is too small to be meaningful.

Only in the two following instances does the type of state organization administering the programs seem to have some influence:

(1) A majority of both public and private presidents prefer direct implementation of the facilities program and the equipment program in coordinating board states where separate agencies administer the programs.

(2) A majority of the private presidents prefer direct implementation of the community service program in coordinating board states where the program is administered by the coordinating board. Here, as in the preceding paragraph, the small number of responses in each of the subgroups makes questionable the significance of the results.

On the basis of the nature of the institutions (i.e., whether or not they have doctoral programs) represented by the presidents responding, the following observations and conclusions can be made:

(1) Although a substantial majority of the presidents from public, doctoral-granting institutions prefer state coordination for each of the four programs, more (i.e., a greater percentage) of this group favor direct implementation for each of the programs than do the presidents of public institutions without doctoral programs.

(2) The responses of the presidents of private institutions without doctoral programs are not substantially different from the responses of presidents of similar institutions in the public sector.

(3) One significant difference, however, is the preference expressed by a majority of the presidents of private, doctoral-granting institutions for direct institutional implementation for all but the technical services program when their choice is based solely on institutional interests and for all but the community services program when broader considerations are involved.

Reactions to the Expansion of State-Coordinated Programs

Opinions of the Governors

In view of the favorable reactions of state governors, state agencies, and institutional presidents (except as noted in the previous section) to state coordination for the four existing programs under study, approval of an expansion of this concept both generally and to certain other specific programs might be expected. As should be anticipated, the governors overwhemingly support general expansion of state involvement in the planning and administration of federal programs for higher education. Of thirty-two governors responding to the question, "Do you favor extension of the concept of 'state-coordination' of Federal aid to higher education to other programs?," twenty-one answer in the affirmative, ten say "yes, but only with adequate safeguards for the interest of private institutions," and only one governor responds negatively.

Opinions of State Agencies Administering Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act

State agencies responsible for the administration of the undergraduate facilities program were queried whether from the viewpoint of state planning and coordination it would be desirable for Title II, the graduate facilities program, to be administered under a state plan by the state agency handling the undergraduate facilities program. Twenty-five of these agencies express the opinion that this would be desirable but fourteen believe otherwise. Table 27 shows that the major dissent comes from the separate agencies (*i.e.*, agencies other than governing boards, coordinating agencies or state boards of education with general coordinating responsibility), with fourteen in favor of adding the graduate facilities program and eleven opposed. The three governing boards, the two state boards of education with coordinating responsibilities and a majority of the coordinating agencies that administer the undergraduate facilities program favor state coordination for the Title II program. These different reactions relate to the different nature and functions of the two types of agencies. Most of the separate agencies were created solely as administrative agencies for the facilities program and their authority is limited to implementing that program and the undergraduate equipment program, whereas, the general state coordinating agencies designated to administer this program also have some responsibility for the general planning and coordination of higher education in these states. Consequently, as indicated by several of the comments to this question, some of the general coordinating bodies see the administration of the graduate facilities program as being consistent with their overall coordinating responsibilities, whereas, some of the separate agencies react negatively because they recognize that administration of the graduate facilities program would be quite different from the administration of the Title I program in which priorities are determined solely on the basis of objective criteria and would require subjective quality judgments which they do not feel qualified to make.

The agencies administering the undergraduate facilities program were also asked if it would be desirable from the standpoint of state planning and coordination for them to administer Title III, the facilities loans program. Twenty-four favor adding this responsibility and fourteen do not. Table 28 shows that the different types of agencies respond in about the same proportion as they do for Title II, although the answers of individual agencies may differ. Several of the agencies favoring state coordination for the loan program comment that it is closely related to the Title I program and constitutes merely another source of funding for many of the same projects; consequently, they believe that coordination of the two programs by the same agency would be more efficient than is now the case. Additional comments relating both to Title II and to Title III will be found on page 32 in Chapter 2.

Table 27

AGENCIES' VIEWS ON TITLE II, HEFA, ADMINISTRATION
BY TITLE I, HEFA, AGENCY

Question: From the viewpoint of state planning and coordination would it be desirable for Title II - Graduate Facilities, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, to be administered under a state plan by the same state agency which administers Title I - Undergraduate Facilities?

Responses of
Agencies Administering the Higher Education Facilities Act,
Title I

Type of Agency	Yes	No	Other	Number Answering	Number Involved
Governing Board	3	0	0	3	3
Coordinating Agency	6	3	1	10	11
State Board of Education[a]	2	0	0	2	2
Special Agency[b]	14	11	1	26	34
Totals	25	14	2	41	50

[a] With general coordinating responsibilities

[b] Includes specially created facilities agencies and other state agencies, including state boards of education which do not have general coordinating responsibilities.

Table 28

AGENCIES' VIEWS ON CORRELATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF TITLE III - LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION, WITH TITLE I

Question: From the viewpoint of state planning and coordination would it be desirable for Title III - Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, to be correlated with the administration of Title I to permit the designated state agency to include loans as well as grants in its state plan, with authority to recommend priorities, either identical or different, for each of the two sources of funds?

Responses of
Agencies Administering the Higher Education Facilities Act
Title I

Type of Agency	Yes	No	Other	Number Answering	Number Involved
Governing Board	2	0	0	2	3
Coordinating Agency	4	4	2	10	11
State Board of Education[a]	2	0	0	2	2
Special Agency[b]	16	10	2	28	34
Totals	24	14	4	42	50

[a] With general coordinating responsibilities

[b] Includes specially created facilities agencies and other state agencies, including state boards of education which do not have general coordinating responsibilities.

Opinions of Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies

The statewide governing and coordinating agencies were asked to express an opinion on the extension of state coordination to one specific program and on the extension generally to other programs. They also were asked to suggest the types of federal programs appropriate for state coordination and the types of federal programs which appropriately should be implemented solely and directly with individual institutions. On the question of extending the concept of state coordination to Title II A, HEA, grants for improvement of library resources, nineteen of the statewide agencies express approval and five indicate disapproval. Three other agencies answered by comment, two of which are favorable to state coordination of this program and one expresses indifference. Four of the five agencies expressing disapproval are statewide governing boards.

In answer to the question whether there were other federal programs now implemented directly with the institutions which would enhance state planning and coordination of higher education if administered under a state plan by a state agency, ten of the agencies answer "yes," two say "no," and fifteen indicate that they are not prepared to express an opinion. Those answering in the affirmative were requested to list the program or programs which they thought should be coordinated and administered under a state plan. A coordinating agency and a state department of education state that all federal programs should be handled this way. Specific programs listed by the other agencies are as follows: graduate facilities by five agencies, facility loans by two agencies, non-sponsored research by three agencies, developing institutions program by three agencies, and library improvement grants by two agencies. One coordinating agency would include under state coordination "all programs designed to support new or upgraded training of specialized personnel such as education professions, teachers of handicapped, libraries, etc. (not summer institutes or academic year institutes)." Another coordinating agency expresses the opinion that "more state administration of Federal programs would strengthen the State-Federal partnership."

In a further attempt to find some general principle for determining the types of federal programs which should be administered by state agencies under state plans and those which should be implemented solely and directly with individual institutions, the statewide governing and coordinating agencies were asked to suggest the types of programs to be included in each category. Because of the importance of this issue to the structuring of future federal programs and to the evaluation of existing programs as they are periodically reviewed by federal administrative agencies and the Congress, the answers of the twenty-two agencies responding, and the answers of one hundred and four presidents responding to a similar question, were analyzed with particular care.

The replies are difficult to summarize or categorize. The responses of the twenty-two state agencies vary from the statement that all federal programs should be administered by a state agency (from a governing board, a coordinating agency and a state department of education, and another from a coordinating agency to the same effect as regards all institutions whose functions, programs and resources are coordinated by the state agency) to the statement by a coordinating agency that "most programs should be left with the institutions and should be on a categorical or programmatic basis," and by another coordinating agency that only the undergraduate facilities and equipment programs should be under state plans. Three coordinating agencies and a governing board take the position that all programs except research programs should be handled through state agencies. One coordinating agency would leave only research programs and graduate facilities programs solely with the institutions, whereas another would have all equipment and facilities grants and institutional research grants administered by a state agency.

Several of the other replies are ambiguous or are so worded as to make difficult the ascertainment of their intent, but five coordinating agencies attempt statements of general principle for determining the types of federal programs which should be administered under state plans and those which should be handled directly by the institutions. Each of them is deserving of special note.

One coordinating agency makes the broad generalization that the state should administer "any program with statewide implications as contrasted to purely local, or disciplinary or academic matters of concern to faculties." The responses of the other coordinating agencies imply a somewhat different role for the state agencies. The view is most succinctly stated in the following reply: "*[The]* Board should have *approval* but not *administration* of most Federal programs to assure that institutions are operating within assigned functions and programs." (Italics added for emphasis). The other three responses envision both state-administered and institution-administered programs, but see a role for the state agency even for the latter type programs. One coordinating board states: "Small, individual research grants should go directly to the institutions. Large research and facilities grants and certain instructional program grants should be cleared with the state coordinating agency before being approved by the federal agency." Another responded as follows: "State agency--when needs are being identified, or priorities required among institutions; institution--after need determination, to support activities within the established and/or assigned missions of the institution." Perhaps the clearest exposition of this viewpoint is contained in the following coordinating agency response: "Where federal objectives apply to all (or most) institutions in a state and affect higher education generally, programs should be handled through state agency. Where federal objectives pertain to individual faculty, or to specific institutions, direct relations are appropriate--with clearance with state agency concerned when institutional role or stature is involved."

All four of these responses propose a role for the state coordinating agency which would give that agency authority to approve or disapprove institutional participation in institution-oriented federal programs based on the appropriateness of that participation to the assigned role and scope of the particular institution. This authority is clearly within the scope of the governance of public institutions by statewide governing boards. In a few of the other states, state-supported institutions of higher education must now clear with the governor, coordinating agency, or other state agency or official all applications for federal grants, or all applications above a prescribed amount. In most states, however, such a review procedure does not now exist. From the viewpoint of the state, this procedure provides a means for acquiring advance knowledge of and, if necessary, protecting against future substantial commitments of state funds. From the viewpoint of the institutions, such a requirement is regarded, in many instances, as involving additional delay and red tape and, more importantly, as a further erosion of the autonomy of the institutions.

It is obvious from these comments that a number of the state agencies are primarily concerned with the impact of federal programs on the public institutions for which they have some responsibility and are not particularly concerned with the involvement of the private institutions in these programs. They are not as much interested in having the responsibility for the administration of federal programs as they are in having the authority to screen the applications of the public institutions to determine future funding obligations or implications and the appropriateness of each application to the role or mission of the institution. From this viewpoint, the desired objectives could be achieved by a change in state procedure without changing the federal programs and without involving private institutions in state administrative procedure.

Opinions of Presidents

The presidents were asked to express their opinions on converting the graduate facilities program and the academic facilities loan program to programs administered under state plans by the state agencies administering the undergraduate facilities program. As reported in a previous section, a substantial majority of these state facilities agencies, from the viewpoint of state planning and coordination, favor their assumption of the administration of these two programs.

As a group, the presidents expressing a definite opinion oppose the administration of the graduate facilities program by the state facilities agencies seventy-two to fifty-five. But more revealing and more meaningful are the opinions of presidents of institutions with doctoral programs. Table 29 shows that although twenty-four of these presidents favor state coordination of graduate facilities programs, fifty-six are opposed. This opposition by institutions with doctoral programs exists for both public and private institutions and for all types of state coordination. Clearly those who would be affected most by a change to a state administered plan are predominantly against such a change.

The comments of presidents opposed to state coordination of the graduate facilities program stress the following points: (1) graduate education is regional and national in nature and should be evaluated and supported at the national level; (2) the highly specialized knowledge to evaluate graduate needs is less likely to exist at the state level than in Washington; (3) because of the in-state competition to expand graduate programs, outside judgments are needed to avoid political decisions; (4) the limited number of graduate institutions in many states makes state administration unnecessary; (5) the criteria for decisions on graduate facilities are, or should be, completely different from the purely objective criteria applicable to undergraduate facilities; and (6) the more limited funds available under the Title II program as compared to the Title I program would be ineffectively utilized if allocated on a state basis.

Table 29

PRESIDENTS' VIEWS ON ADMINISTRATION OF TITLE II, HEFA

Question: If Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act is being effectively administered by the designated state agency in your state, would it be desirable for Title II of the Act, providing grants for graduate facilities, to be administered under a state plan by the same agency?

Presidents' Responses

Type of Coordination	Yes		No		
	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Answer
Voluntary	1	1	0	2	0
Gov. Bd.	7	9	2	11	0
Coord. Ag.	13	9	10	28	8
St. Bd. of Ed.	2	3	1	7	1
No Formal	8	2	3	8	4
Totals	31	24	16	56	13
	(55)		(72)		

Type of Institution	Yes		No		
	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Answer
Public	17	22	5	41	6
Private:					
Catholic	2	1	2	2	3
Protestant	9	1	5	1	1
Other	3	0	4	12	3
Total Private	14	2	11	15	7
Totals	31	24	16	56	13
	(55)		(72)		

Presidents giving "other" responses - 6. Total responding - 133.

The comments of presidents of graduate institutions who favor state coordination of the graduate facilities program include the following: (1) the present administration of Title II is of limited benefit to institutions with emerging graduate programs; (2) many facility projects combine graduate and undergraduate functions and could be better coordinated by one agency; (3) state authorities are more familiar with the needs of the institutions; (4) a state agency can exercise restraint on the smaller institutions; and (5) the frequent meetings and extended negotiations required can more conveniently be conducted at the state level.

A justifiable criticism of the wording of the question was made by two presidents. The question reads: "If Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act is being effectively and fairly administered by the designated state agency in your state, would it be desirable for Title II of the Act, providing grants for graduate facilities, to be administered under a state plan by the same agency?" So worded, the question incorporates conditions which may or may not exist in a particular state. A president who does not consider that the Title I program is "being effectively and fairly administered" would have difficulty in expressing his opinion regarding Title II. However, this faulty phrasing of the question is believed not to invalidate the general negative reaction of the presidents who responded.

The reactions of the presidents to the desirability for giving the state agency administering the undergraduate facilities program the responsibility also for administering the facilities loans program differ substantially from their reaction to state coordination of the graduate facilities program. Table 29 summarizes and categorizes these responses.

As a group, a small majority of the presidents favor state administration of the facilities loan program, but there are marked differences between the opinions of the public and private presidents and between the presidents of doctoral institutions and those who represent institutions without doctoral programs. Whereas fifty-six percent of the public presidents favor state coordination, the same percentage of the private presidents prefer the present direct program. A comparison of the responses on the basis of the type of institution shows that seventy percent of the presidents of institutions without doctoral programs favor state coordination of the loans programs but that sixty percent of the presidents of doctoral institutions believe that a change to state coordination would not be desirable.

An analysis of the opinions of the private institutional presidents is interesting. Presidents of Catholic-related institutions are evenly divided, four and four, on the question; presidents of Protestant-related institutions favor state coordination by eleven to six; but presidents of independent, or non-church related, private institutions are fourteen to four in opposition to bringing the facilities loans program under the administration of a state agency.

The substantial difference in opinion by private institutional presidents in these three categories is very likely based on the difference in the institutions responding. Eleven of the eighteen independent private institutions have doctoral programs whereas only two of the Protestant-related and two of the Catholic-related institutions have such programs. More of the independent private institutions responding are larger, more complex institutions; more of the church-related institutions responding are smaller, predominantly undergraduate institutions. Many of the smaller institutions, with limited administrative staffs, have found the state agencies administering the facilities program to be of invaluable assistance is aiding with the planning and paper work incident to receiving federal grants. The importance and value of this assistance to the small institution was frequently referred to in the interviews and in comments on the questionnaire. Quite naturally, these smaller institutions anticipate the same kind of help in making application for federal facilities loans and, therefore, look with favor upon the state facilities agency assuming responsibility for the administration of the loans program. Because they have, in general, shared equitably in the undergraduate facilities program, they have reason to believe that they would receive similar treatment in a state administered loan program, and, in addition, would have the benefit of the expertise and help of the agency staff. Conversely, the larger, more complex institutions need less help and have greater confidence in their ability to negotiate directly with the federal agencies to their own advantage. As a consequence, these institutions are more apprehensive of the consequences which might result from coming under a state-administered program.

These comments are also applicable to some extent to the division of opinions in the public sector, although difference in size may not be as important a factor. The convictions of many graduate institutions that judgments and decisions made in Washington are preferable to those made at the state level are shared by public as well as private institutions.

Not only were the presidents asked for their reactions to the extension of the concept of state coordination to the graduate facilities program and the facilities loans programs, but also their opinions on the conversion of other direct federal programs to state coordination were sought. Specifically, the presidents were asked if there were other federal programs (e.g., Title II, HEA, College Library Assistance Program) which if administered by a state agency under a state plan would enhance both institutional interests and state planning and coordination. Twenty-seven presidents answer "yes," fifty-three say "no," and fifty-two indicate that they are not prepared to give a definite opinion.

Table 31 analyzes the presidents' answers by type of institution. A comparison of the responses from the public sector with the responses from the private sector shows that only twenty-three percent of the public presidents and fifteen percent of the private presidents give answers favoring state coordination for any of the existing federal programs im-

Table 30

PRESIDENTS' VIEWS ON ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION OF TITLE III, HEFA AND TITLE I, HEFA

Question: Would it be desirable for Title III, Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, to be correlated with the administration of Title I to permit the state agency to administer applications for loans as well as grants, with authority to establish priorities, either identical or different, for each of the two sources of funds?

Presidents' Responses

	Yes		No		
Type of Coordination	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Answer
Voluntary	1	1	0	2	0
Gov. Bd.	9	9	1	6	6
Coord. Ag.	14	10	9	21	13
St. Bd. of Ed.	2	3	1	6	2
No Formal	9	3	5	6	5
Totals	35	26	16	41	26
	(61)		(57)		
Type of Institution					
Public	19	23	4	29	18
Private:					
Catholic	3	1	3	1	2
Protestant	10	1	5	1	1
Other	3	1	4	10	5
Total Private	16	3	12	12	8
Totals	35	26	16	41	26
	(61)		(57)		

Presidents giving "other" responses - 2. Total responses - 120.

Table 31

PRESIDENTS' SUGGESTIONS ON ADMINISTRATION OF OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS BY STATE AGENCY

Question: Are there other institution-oriented federal programs in higher education (e.g., Title II, College Library Assistance, Higher Education Act of 1965) which if administered by a state agency under an approved state plan would enhance both the reasonable interests of individual institutions and state planning and coordination of higher education?

Presidents' Responses

Type of Coordination	Yes		No		Not Prepared to say		No Answer
	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	
Voluntary	1	0	0	2	0	1	0
Gov. Bd.	4	2	3	3	4	12	2
Coord. Ag.	8	9	14	12	6	11	8
St. Bd. of Ed.	0	0	2	6	2	4	0
No Formal	3	0	6	5	7	5	1
Totals	16	11	25	28	19	33	11
	(27)		(53)		(52)		

Table 31 (Continued)

Presidents' Responses

Type of Institution	Yes		No		Not Prepared to say		No Answer
	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	No Doctoral Program	Doctoral Program	
Public	10	10	8	18	11	27	6
Private:							
Catholic	1	0	5	0	1	2	1
Protestant	4	1	8	1	3	1	0
Other	1	0	4	9	4	3	4
Total Private	6	1	17	10	8	6	5
Totals	16	11	25	28	19	33	11
	(27)		(53)		(52)		

Presidents giving "other" responses - 3. Total responding - 135.

3

plemented directly with the institutions. Thirty percent of the public presidents and fifty-six percent of the private presidents do not favor the conversion of any of the direct programs. A quite substantial number of the presidents, forty-four percent for the public institutions and twenty-nine percent of the private, indicate that they are not prepared to give a definite opinion. When the responses of only the doctoral-granting institutions are considered, only eighteen percent of the public and six percent of the private presidents are favorable to any change and the percentage of those who do not have a definite opinion increases to forty-nine and thirty-five percent.

The considerably more negative reaction of the private presidents is not unexpected. It is an expression of the concern and apprehension felt by many in the private sector toward any move which, in their opinion, would tend to undermine the autonomy of the private institutions. Although a majority of the private presidents express approval of the existing state-coordinated programs, many of them see the conversion of existing institution-oriented federal programs to state-administered status as bringing their institutions more closely within the sphere of influence of state government, with what they fear would be an inevitable encroachment upon their autonomy. Others, especially presidents of many of the smaller institutions, however, believe that their interests could be enhanced by the exertion of influence at the state level which is inconsequential in Washington. They also value the expertise and help which has been made available to them by state facilities agencies and they anticipate similar assistance in other programs.

Consideration should be given to the probable meaning of the many "not prepared to say" answers. Any president opposed in principle to converting institution-oriented programs to state-administered programs probably would have given a definite "no" answer. Consequently, a reasonable conclusion might be that the fifty-two undecided presidents are not categorically opposed to any change which would give the state a role in planning or administering a federal program but prefer to relate their opinions only to specific proposed changes. If this is a reasonable deduction, then the very substantial negative import of the responses is softened, particularly for the public sector. In the private sector, however, even if all of the noncommittal responses are regarded as potential affirmative reactions, there still is a majority of the private presidents that does not see any mutual advantages to the state and to the institutions to be gained by changing any of the institution-oriented federal programs to state-coordinated programs.

Table 31 also shows the responses of the presidents categorized by type of coordination. The following percentage distribution of the responses gives a better comparison of the opinions expressed by each group of presidents:

Table 32

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENTS ON CONVERSION OF OTHER PROGRAMS TO STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATION

	Conversion Acceptable	Conversion Not Acceptable	Not Prepared to Answer
Governing Board States	20%	20%	55%*
Coordinating Board States	27	42	27
State Board of Education States	0	57	43
States Without Formal Coordination	12	42	46

*Figures may not total 100% because of rounding and presence of "other" responses.

These figures point up the large percentage of presidents who are not prepared to express an opinion on the question as it was phrased in general terms. As previously mentioned, these answers can be interpreted as not being negative toward the conversion of any direct program to state coordination but rather as a desire to reserve judgment for specific proposals. To the extent that this is an accurate interpretation of these responses, only in the state board of education states is there a clear majority opposed in principle to any conversion of direct federal programs to state coordination, and the presidents in governing board states are least negative of all the groups toward conversion to state coordination. If consideration is given only to those answers expressing a definite opinion, the presidents in governing board states are more favorable toward state coordination than are the presidents in the other groups of states.

Three possible reasons for this difference in reaction may have some validity. In several of the states with statewide governing boards, the number of institutions is quite small with fewer possibilities for institutional frictions; the concept of governing board responsibility for all higher education or for all senior institutions of higher education is older, with better determined relationships between the board and the institutions and state government than the newer, less well defined concept of coordination of independent institutions or systems of institutions; and the institutions under the authority of a statewide board responsible only for higher education are more accustomed to administration at the state level and perhaps feel better protected by a board devoted solely to their interests.

The presidents who indicated that there are institution-oriented federal programs which could be administered by state agencies under state plans and still serve both the reasonable interests of the institutions and state planning and coordination were asked to identify any program or programs which could be so changed. Among the small number of presidents listing such programs, three say that all federal programs should be so handled, ten list the library assistance program (probably because this program was specifically named in the question as an example of an institution-oriented program which might be made a state-coordinated program), one says "some faculty research programs," one lists education television programs, and one would include "any Federal program in which there is an automatic allocation to the states." This listing is entirely too small to be meaningful except to the extent that the lack of specific examples may indicate an inability of most of the presidents giving a general affirmative response to specify any particular direct programs which they would favor converting to state coordination.

One hundred and four presidents responded to the request to give examples of the types of federal programs which should be implemented solely and directly with individual institutions without intervention of state agencies. Table 33 analyzes the responses of eighty-six of the presidents. The answers of the other eighteen presidents either are too general in nature to categorize, ambiguous, or list a program not mentioned by any other president. Eight public institution presidents and eight private institution presidents, prefer all federal programs to be implemented directly with the institutions. An additional five, three public and two private institution presidents, prefer "nearly all" programs to be direct. Four of these presidents and ten of the sixteen desiring all programs to be direct are in states with coordinating agencies, and a substantial majority of the twenty-one represent doctoral-granting institutions.

This concentration of opposition to any state coordination of federal programs in states with coordinating agencies is further evidence of the still unsettled role of the state coordinating agency in many states and the apprehension of many public instituion presidents toward the concept of state coordination of higher education by agencies inserted between the institutions and the established organizations of state government. A number of private institution presidents, aware of this uncertainty and apprehension in the public sector, are likewise apprehensive about any closer involvement of their institutions in the sphere of state-coordinated efforts. The predominance of presidents of doctoral-granting institutions expressing this opinion is consistent with previous findings related to this type of institution.

At the other end of the spectrum of opinion, four private institution presidents state that none of the federal programs should be implemented directly with the institutions. Three of the four are in states having coordinating agencies and all are from institutions without doctoral programs. The latter fact is probably more significant than the type of coordination. All four are presidents of small, church-related institutions who, most likely, feel the need for outside expertise and help in applying for federal aid more than they fear a closer relationship with state agencies charged with the coordination of higher education.

As Table 33 reveals, the area or function about which the presidents feel most protective of the right of direct access to the federal agencies in Washington is research. Thirty public institution presidents and thirteen private institution presidents list research programs as an example of the type of federal programs which should be implemented directly between the institutions and Washington. Twenty-four of the thirty presidents of public institutions and seven of the thirteen private institution presidents represent universities with doctoral programs.

Although the responses listing NSF-NIH type programs, graduate and/or professional programs, and departmental or institutional development programs as types of programs which should be implemented directly are considerably fewer in number than those listing research programs, taken together they encompass an area of institutional activity closely related to research. Somewhat surprising is the small number of presidents (a total of five including only one private institution president) who mentioned the graduate facilities program as one which should be implemented directly between the institutions and the federal agency. The possible reason for the small number listing this program is that the presidents were asked to respond specifically to this issue in another part of the questionnaire. Their responses, which as a group show a two-to-one majority against converting the graduate facilities program to a state-coordinated program, were discussed previously.

One other classification is worthy of special note. Four private institution presidents believe that all programs requiring qualitative judgments should be implemented directly between the institutions and the federal agencies involved without the intervention of state agencies. This position reflects the viewpoint expressed in different contexts by a number of private institution presidents and some public institution presidents that there is greater sophistication and expertise in educational matters to be found on the staffs of the federal agencies. For those with this conviction, it is natural to prefer qualitative judgments of faculty, research proposals, educational programs and institutions to be made in Washington rather than at the state level.

Among the responses of the eighteen presidents whose replies are not included in Table 33, two from presidents of large private universities are of especial interest. One response is as follows:

> State plans are adaptable to undergraduate work. Facilities programs for research and training at the graduate level should be awarded to the dynamic, vital institution. There are

Table 33

FEDERAL PROGRAMS THAT PRESIDENTS WANT ADMINISTERED BY INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS

Question: Please give examples of the types of federal programs which in your opinion should be implemented solely and directly with individual institutions without the intervention of state agencies.

Responses of Presidents

Type of Coordination	All or nearly all Prog's	Support of Research	NSF-NIH Type Prog's	Grad. Prof. Educ.	Depart'l or Inst.	Programs Involving Qualitative Judgment	Inter nat'l. Prog's	Land grant Prog's	Student aid Prog's	Grad. Facil.	None
Presidents of Public Institutions: (n=48)											
Voluntary	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Gov. Bd.	0	5	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	0	0
Coord. Ag.	7	16	7	4	7	0	1	1	2	4	0
St. Bd. of Ed.	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
No Formal	2	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0
Total Public	10	30	11	6	9	0	3	2	7	5	0
Presidents of Private Institutions: (n=38)											
Voluntary	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1
Coord. Ag.	7	8	2	4	3	2	0	0	2	0	3
St. Bd. of Ed.	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0
No Formal	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Private	10	13	5	4	6	4	0	0	5	1	4
Total all Pres.	20	43	16	10	15	4	3	2	12	6	4

> certain Federal programs which should be regional in character and cut across state lines as well as future programs which take into account the urban location of institutions. In addition there are certain programs in which the concentration of effort and personnel are critical and are national in nature. These programs require a qualitative evaluation and should be supplemented at the federal level directly because they are significant to the development of human resources and research on a national level.

This respondent attempts to distinguish between programs appropriate for state planning and implementation and programs which should be implemented directly with the institution on two principal bases. One basis is the distinction between undergraduate and graduate education; the other is the essential nature and purpose of the federal program. This respondent sees graduate programs as affected with the national interest and, therefore, to be implemented on the national or at least regional level. He implies that all programs which have objectives which are related merely to local considerations are appropriate for state planning and implementation, but he firmly asserts that programs which are involved with national concerns and goals should be implemented between individual institutions and the federal agencies. He believes that these programs require qualitative evaluations of the possible contributions of the institutions to the attainment of the program objectives that can appropriately be made only at the national level.

The other response which is of special significance states:

> In general, all Federal programs involving higher education, graduate or undergraduate, should be administered directly by the Federal agency involved except for programs such as the undergraduate facilities program where the national need is broadly enough distributed that formula allocation by state is an appropriate funding mechanism, where there are objective criteria which will ensure the fulfullment of the national purpose and treat public and private institutions equitably, and where the funds are additive and do not replace already existing direct Federal support, but are not so small that

> funds allocation by state would dissipate them ineffectively.

This response, unlike the other, does not make a categorical distinction between undergraduate and graduate programs, but starts with the premise that all federal programs involving higher education, graduate or undergraduate, should be administered directly by the federal agency involved. Implementation by a state agency of any federal program for higher education is regarded as the exceptional situation which is justified only if the criteria prescribed are met. While at least one existing state-administered federal program, the undergraduate facilities program, is acceptable to this president, he would not favor any new state-administered program which would replace "already existing direct Federal support." This position would exclude state administration of any existing direct federal-aid program although it might otherwise meet all the other criteria which he proposes.

These other criteria establish some essential bases for state-administered federal programs: (1) a national need so widely distributed among the states as to make formula allocation by state an appropriate funding mechanism; (2) objective criteria which ensure the fulfullment of the national purpose of the programs and treat public and private institutions equitably; and (3) a total funding not so small that funds allocated by state would dissipate ineffectively the funds appropriated.

The requirement of the existence of "objective criteria" as a basis for state-administered programs is consistent with the position of the president previously quoted who would reserve to the federal agencies programs involving qualitative evaluations. In other respects, the two approaches are quite differently stated, although in application to specific programs, the conclusions might well be similar.

Summary of the Reactions to An Expansion of State-Coordinated Programs

In seeking to determine the reaction of the different groups included in the study to an expansion of state coordination to other federal programs, the state agencies administering the facilities program, the statewide governing and coordinating agencies, and the presidents were queried regarding the conversion from direct implementation to state coordination of certain specific programs, and the latter two groups and the governors were asked for their opinions on the general question of converting direct programs to state-coordinated programs.

A substantial majority of the state agencies responsible for the administration of the undergraduate facilities program believe that it would be desirable from the standpoint of state planning and coordination for them also to administer the graduate facilities program and the facilities loan program which are now implemented directly between Washington and the institutions. Conversely, a majority of the presidents as a group, and a substantial majority of the presidents of doctoral granting institutions, are opposed to such a change for the graduate facilities program. In regard to a change from direct to state implementation for the facilities loan program, a majority of the public institution presidents believe the change would be desirable but a majority of the presidents of private institutions express the opposite opinion. Among both the public and private presidents, the major opposition is from representatives of the more complex, doctoral-granting institutions.

On the general question of the extension of the concept of state coordination to other programs, thirty-one of thirty-two governors responding favor such action, although ten add the qualification, "but only with adequate safeguards for the interest of private institutions." Among the governing and coordinating agencies and the presidents much uncertainty exists as to whether state planning and coordination would be enhanced by converting any of the programs now implemented directly with the institutions to state-coordinated programs. Of the twenty-seven state agencies answering, only two give a negative response but fifteen indicate that they are not prepared to express an opinion. Among the eighty presidents giving a definite answer, a two-to-one majority responds negatively, but fifty-two presidents indicate that they are not prepared to give an opinion. A substantially larger proportion of the private presidents than the public presidents express a definite opinion, and of those expressing a definite opinion the percentage of the private presidents expressing a negative reaction to the conversion of direct programs to state-coordinated programs is approximately eighty percent compared to slightly less than sixty percent of the public presidents expressing that opinion. If the answers of those who say that they are not prepared to express an opinion are interpreted as an indication that they are not categorically opposed to any conversion of direct federal programs to a state-coordinated status, the otherwise predominant opposition to conversion of directly implemented programs is largely negated, especially for the public presidents.

The ten state agencies and the twenty-seven presidents who believe that state planning and coordination (and, in the opinion of the presidents, also the reasonable interests of individual institutions) would be enhanced by converting directly-implemented programs to state-coordinated programs were asked to give examples of the programs or types of programs which they had in mind. Among the programs listed by the agencies were the following: all federal programs, graduate facilities, facility loans, nonsponsored research, developing institutions, and library improvements. Sixteen of the twenty-seven presidents give the following examples: all federal programs (by three presidents), library assistance (by ten presidents), some faculty research programs, educational television, and "any Federal program in which there is an automatic allocation to the states."

The statewide agencies were asked to suggest the types of federal programs which should be administered by the state and those which should be implemented directly with the institutions, and the presidents were asked to give examples of the types of federal programs which should be implemented solely and directly with the institutions. The responses of the agencies range from the opinion expressed by three agencies that all federal programs should be administered by a state agency to the opinion of one agency that "most programs should be left with the institutions." Five agencies attempted general statements of policy. Twenty-one presidents believe that either all or "nearly all" federal programs should be implemented directly, but, surprisingly, four private presidents express the opinion that none of the federal programs should be so implemented. The other presidents list most frequently as examples of programs which should be left with the institutions research programs, NSF-NIH type programs, departmental or institutional development programs, graduate and professional education programs, and student aid, with research programs being listed much more frequently than any other example given.

Chapter 4

PROPOSALS FOR NEW FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Federal Support for State and Institutional Planning

During the interviewing of governors, directors of statewide agencies and presidents prior to the finalization of the questionnaires, one area which was repeatedly mentioned was that of planning. The importance of the impact of federal planning funds made available to the states under the 1966 amendment to Title I, HEFA was stressed by members of each of the above groups. Although questions were raised about these funds going to state facilities agencies rather than to the statewide governing and coordinating agencies in states where separate state agencies administer the facilities programs, the concept of federal assistance for basic educational planning was strongly supported. Consequently, questions were included in the questionnaires to the governors, statewide governing and coordinating agencies, and presidents to determine their reactions to more general federal support of planning activities of both the state and the institutions.

Reactions of Governing and Coordinating Agencies

In recent years much has been said and written about the developing of state master plans for higher education, and the master plans in some states have drawn much attention both within the particular states and in the national educational community. However, of the thirty governing and coordinating agencies responding to a query about the existence of a state master plan for higher education in their states, fifteen indicate that a master plan has been developed and fifteen indicate that their states as yet do not have such a plan.

According to these state agencies, comprehensive master plans exist in Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, but had not been developed at the time of the survey in Arkansas, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah and Virginia. Florida and Massachusetts did not answer this question. The state agencies in nine of the fifteen states without master plans and in Florida and Massachusetts indicate that their states are developing master plans; but in five of the states not having such plans, the state agencies indicate that state master plans are not being developed. Two agencies which said their states had state master plans also indicated

Table 34

AGENCIES' OPINIONS ON FEDERAL GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANNING

Question: Currently there are proposals before Congress to provide Federal grants to the states for comprehensive state educational planning.

a. Does your state now have a comprehensive master plan for higher education?

b. If not, is your state now developing a comprehensive master plan for higher education?

c. Does the existing or developing state master plan include private as well as public institutions of higher education?

d. Are Federal funds needed to inaugurate, complete, or supplement your state master plan for higher education?

e. Without regard to a "master plan" as such, are Federal funds needed for instituting, completing, or supplementing general educational planning activities in higher education?

f. Do you consider Federal support for comprehensive planning for higher education in each state a desirable and appropriate Federal assistance program?

g. If Federal planning funds are made available, should they be provided both to the state for overall planning and to the public and private institutions for institutional planning?

Table 34 (Continued)

Responses of Agencies

	a		b		c			d		e		f		g		
Type	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Not Applicable	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Only to State	Only to Institution
Gov. Bd.	5	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	2	4	3	5	2	2	4	1
Coord. Ag.	7	12	10	3	13	3	2	12	5	13	6	17	1	10	8	0
St. Bd. of Ed.	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	1	1	0
Total	15	15	13	5	18	5	5	19	7	20	9	25	3	13	13	1
	(30)		(18)		(28)			(26)*		(29)		(28)		(27)		

---

*In addition, a governing board and a coordinating agency stated that their states did not have and did not plan to develop a state master plan in the near future.

that master plans were being developed. Apparently, this means that a restudy is underway. These responses as well as those discussed below are summarized in Table 34.

Among the thirty state agencies responding, a majority of the state coordinating agencies indicate that their states do not yet have master plans; but the three state boards of education and a majority of the governing boards state that their states do have master plans.

Eighteen of the state agencies indicate that their existing or developing master plan includes private institutions while five say that it does not. If the question concerning the inclusion of private institutions had been more aptly worded, a better response might have been received. Instead of inquiring whether private institutions were "included" in the state plan, a better phrasing would have asked if the roles and future plans of private institutions were determined and considered in the structuring of the state plan.

A large majority (nineteen of twenty-eight agencies responding) of the governing and coordinating agencies see a need for federal funds to inaugurate, complete or supplement their state master plans. Only seven are of the opinion that federal funds are not needed, and several of these agencies comment that the planning function is the obligation of their states. One governing board and one coordinating agency state that their states do not have a master plan and do not plan to develop one in the near future.

The question of federal support in this area was broadened by inquiring if federal funds were needed to institute, complete or supplement general educational planning activities in higher education. Only a bare majority (four out of seven) of the governing boards responding are of the opinion that such a need exists, but all three of the state boards of education responding and more than two-thirds of the coordinating agencies answering believe that federal funds are needed.

But is federal assistance for comprehensive state planning a desirable and appropriate area for federal assistance? Twenty-five of the twenty-eight agencies expressing an opinion do regard planning as an appropriate federal program, particularly in view of the already limited planning program under Title I, HEFA.

The agencies, however, are quite divided as to who should receive the federal funds for planning in the event that more general federal support for this function is made available. Thirteen express the opinion that federal funds should be provided both to the state for overall planning and to the institutions for institutional planning. Thirteen would want any such federal assistance to go only to the states and one governing board would have the federal funds provided only to the institutions. Consistent with the different nature of statewide governing boards and state coordinating agencies, a majority of the governing boards responding believe that federal planning funds should go only to the state while a majority of the coordinating agencies expressing an opinion would have such support go to both the state and to the institutions.

Reactions of the Governors

An even larger majority of the governors recognize a need for federal funds for general educational planning in their states than the majority of state governing and coordinating agencies having the same opinion. Thirty-one of the thirty-six governors responding affirm the need for federal assistance and one other states that such funds would accelerate state planning already underway. (See Table 35.) Twenty-one of the governors would favor federal assistance both to the state and to the institutions but ten would want the federal funds to be made available only to the states. Four other governors favor a plan whereby the funds would go to the states but with a provision that a portion of such funds would then be made available to the institutions for institutional planning. Not one of the governors responding would favor a program in which all planning funds would go directly to the institutions, and only among the states with coordinating agencies is there a substantial majority in favor of either a division of federal funds between the state and its institution or a provision for institutional sharing of funds made available to the states.

Because in the early interviewing of presidents a number had expressed a need for funds to inaugurate institutional research and planning offices or to expand embryo operations of that kind, and had commented on the difficulty of obtaining adequate funds for such activities either from state government for public institutions or from trustees of private institutions, the governors were queried as to their reactions to a federal program for this purpose. The governors' responses were somewhat surprising. Twenty-one of the thirty-two governors responding to a question as to the appropriateness of a federal program to provide support for institutional research and planning offices express a favorable opinion. And this favorable majority exists in states without any formal coordination of higher education as well as in each of the groups of states with statewide governing boards, with coordinating agencies, and with state board of education responsibility.

A majority (seventeen of the twenty-nine responding) of the governors prefer such a federal program, if instituted, to be on a continuing basis. Most of the twelve who express a preference for a three- to five-year program are those who do not consider federal support for institutional research and planning offices to be an appropriate and worthwhile expenditure of federal funds. Should such a program be implemented, however, twenty-nine of the governors would prefer that the federal funds allocated to the states be administered by state agencies under state plans establishing criteria for determing institutional needs and priorities. Only one

Table 35

GOVERNORS' OPINIONS OF FEDERAL GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANNING

Question: Currently there are proposals before Congress to provide Federal grants to the states for comprehensive state educational planning.

a. Are Federal funds needed for instituting, completing, or supplementing general educational planning activities in higher education in your state?

b. If Federal planning funds are made available, should they be provided both to the state for overall planning and to the public and private institutions for institutional planning?

c. Would you consider a Federal program of annual grants to institutions of higher education to provide basic support for institutional research and planning offices (the amount of the grant to be related to the size and complexity of the institution, with a fixed minimum and maximum) to be an appropriate and worthwhile expenditure of Federal funds in aid of higher education?

d. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, should it be (1) phased out over a 3 to 5 year period, (2) a continuing support program?

e. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, should it be implemented directly with the institutions or should there be state allotments administered by designated state agencies (with representative advisory committees) under approved state plans establishing criteria for determining needs and priorities?

Table 35 (Continued)

Responses of Governors

	a			b					c			d		e		
Type	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Only to state	Only to Inst.	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	3-5	Cont.	Prefer state	Prefer direct	Oth.
Voluntary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	7	2	0	4	3	3	0	0	5	2	0	2	4	6	0	0
Coord. Ag.	15	2	0	12	5	3	0	4	9	4	2	6	7	14	0	1
St. Bd. of Ed.	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	3	0	0
No Formal	7	0	0	3	4	3	0	1	5	2	0	2	5	6	1	0
Total	31	4	1	21	13	10	0	5	21	9	2	12	17	29	1	1
		(36)				(49)				(32)		(29)		(31)		

Table 36

PRESIDENTS' OPINIONS ON FEDERAL GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANNING

Question: Currently there are proposals before Congress to provide Federal grants to the states for comprehensive state educational planning.

a. Are Federal funds needed for instituting, completing, or supplementing general educational planning activities in higher education in your state?

b. If Federal planning funds are made available, should they be provided both to the state for overall planning and to the public and private institutions for institutional planning?

c. Would you consider a Federal program of annual grants to institutions of higher education to provide basic support for institutional research and planning offices (the amount of the grant to be related to the size and complexity of the institution, with a fixed minimum and maximum) to be an appropriate and worthwhile expenditure of Federal funds in aid of higher education?

d. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, should it be (1) phased out over a 3-to 5-year period, (2) a continuing support program?

e. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, should it be implemented directly with the institutions or should there be state allotments administered by designated state agencies (with representative advisory committees) under approved state plans establishing state criteria for determining needs and priorities?

Table 36 (Continued)

Responses of Public Presidents

	a			b				c			d		e		
Type	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	Only to State	Only to Inst.	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	3-5	Cont.	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Oth.
Voluntary	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	21	1	1	17	5	1	0	19	3	0	6	14	5	12	2
Coord. Ag.	33	8	0	35	5	1	0	33	3	1	8	26	12	22	2
St. Bd. of Ed.	5	3	0	7	1	0	0	6	2	0	2	4	3	5	0
No Formal	14	2	0	14	1	0	1	11	2	1	3	11	9	6	0
Total Pub. Pres.	76	14	1	76	12	2	1	69	10	2	19	55	29	45	4
		(91)			(91)				(81)		(74)			(78)	

Table 36 (Continued)

Responses of Private Presidents

	a			b				c			d		e		
Type	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	Only to State	Only to Inst.	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	3-5	Cont.	Prefer State	Prefer Direct	Oth.
Voluntary	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov. Bd.	7	0	1	7	1	0	0	7	1	0	1	6	1	4	1
Coord. Ag.	18	6	0	17	0	2	1	19	4	0	6	15	6	15	1
St. Bd. of Ed.	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	5	1	0	1	4	1	3	2
No Formal	9	1	0	8	1	0	0	8	1	0	2	6	1	7	1
Total Pri. Pres.	39	8	2	39	2	2	1	39	7	0	10	31	9	29	5
		(49)			(44)				(46)		(41)			(43)	
Total All Pres.	115	22	3	115	14	4	2	108	17	2	29	86	38	74	9
		(140)			(135)				(127)		(115)			(121)	

governor would approve direct implementation of the program between the federal agency and the institution.

Reactions of the Presidents

Eighty percent of the presidents of private institutions and a slightly higher percentage of public institution presidents see a need for federal funds for general institutional planning. A few of the presidents expressing the opposite opinion comment that planning is primarily the obligation of the states and should be supported by the states. As revealed by Table 36, the opinions expressed are not substantially different when analyzed on the basis of the different types of coordination.

In regard to how such a proposed program of federal assistance for educational planning should be implemented, slightly more than eighty percent both of the public and private presidents prefer that federal funds for planning should be made available both to the state and to the institutions. The percentage of presidents expressing this preference is the same as the percentage of governors making this choice. Only two public institution presidents and two private institution presidents would prefer the proposed federal program to be implemented solely and directly with the institutions.

Eighty-five percent of both the public and private institution presidents responding (compared to sixty-six percent of the governors) believe that federal grants to support institutional research and planning offices would be an appropriate and worthwhile expenditure of federal funds in aid of higher education. The comments of two large public institution presidents, however, that such a program "is not of high priority" may well represent the feelings of presidents of similar institutions. In contrast to these comments are the expressions of great need for such federal assistance by presidents of small private and public institutions with inadequate administrative staffs. Approximately seventy-five percent of the presidents (compared to sixty percent of the governors) would prefer such a federal assistance program to be on a continuing basis rather than to be phased out over a three- to five-year period. However, only one hundred and fifteen presidents answered this query compared to one hundred and forty who responded to the initial question of federal support for general educational planning.

In the event that Congress should initiate a federal program of annual grants to support institutional research and planning offices, the presidents were asked (as were the governors, as previously discussed) whether such a program should be implemented directly with the institutions or whether the program should provide state allotments to be administered by state agencies under approved state plans establishing criteria for determining needs and priorities. The presidents' responses differ markedly from those of the governors. Whereas, only one governor expresses a preference for direct institutional implementation, almost sixty percent of the public institution presidents and two-thirds of the private institution presidents express this preference. Surprisingly, the only group of presidents in which a majority favor implementation by state coordination is the group representing public institutions in states without formal coordinating agencies. As Table 36 shows, nine of the fifteen presidents in this category express a preference for state-coordinated implementation. Eight of the fifteen are presidents of institutions with doctoral programs and these presidents are equally divided in their preferences between the two methods of implementation. Five of the seven presidents of public institutions without doctoral programs prefer state coordination. In the other categories of public institution presidents, grouped by a type of coordination, there is no significant difference between the preferences expressed by presidents of doctoral institutions and presidents of institutions without doctoral programs.

Among the private institution presidents, the only category in which more than one president expresses a preference for state implementation is the group of presidents in states with coordinating agencies. Six of the twenty-two presidents in this group prefer state implementation. Of these six presidents, five represent private institutions without doctoral programs. Among the nine presidents giving "other" answers, four say that there should be both state and direct implementation, two say that either method is acceptable, and one states that the choice "depends upon the political balance in a state."

On the basis of the above analysis of the presidents' responses, it is difficult, if not impossible, to draw any meaningful conclusion as to the factors motivating their choices of the method of implementation for the proposed program of federal aid for institutional research and planning offices. Some support is present for the general proposition that more of the smaller institutions without doctoral programs tend to favor state coordinated implementation than do the larger, more complex institutions with doctoral programs. Also, in states with coordinating agencies, the degree of satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with the past performance of the agency personnel undoubtedly influences the choice. Probably the strongest motivating force influencing the majority choice of direct implementation may well be the desire to retain as much institutional autonomy as possible, especially in regard to a proposed program to support part of the institutional administrative organization.

Summary

A preponderant majority of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies, of the governors and of the presidents see a need for federal assistance for educational planning and a sizeable majority of both the governors and the presidents believe that such a program should be on a continuing basis. Only in regard to the method of implementation are there differences of opinion among these three groups. The statewide agencies are evenly divided between having the federal funds go both to the states and to the institutions and having all federal assistance go to the states. A substantial majority of the governors and an even greater majority of the presidents favor the former choice.

These responses are also germane to an assessment of the existing federal support for state planning under the 1966 amendment to the Higher Education Facilities Act, which provides funds solely to the state through the state agencies administering the undergraduate facilities program. Apparently, about half of the governing and coordinating agencies and a majority of the governors and the presidents would prefer an expanded federal support program for planning under which funds would be made available both to the state and to the institutions. Moreover, based on the reactions of coordinating agencies to the dispersal of administrative responsibility for the state-coordinated federal programs discussed in the previous chapter, many of the coordinating agencies would prefer that funds for state planning be administered by them rather than by special state agencies. An apparently accurate assessment would be that despite the widely recognized value to the states of the federal grants for planning activities under the Facilities Act, there is considerable support for a separate and expanded program provided planning funds both to the states and to the institutions and administered by the general statewide educational agency.

A substantial majority of the governors and the presidents favor a special program of support for institutional research and planning offices, but the two groups differ sharply on the role of the state in the implementation of such a program. All but one governor would have the federal funds come to the state for disbursement to the institutions under a state plan; whereas, a majority of the presidents would prefer direct implementation between the federal agency and the institutions.

A Federal Program of General Institutional Grants

Need for Federal General Institutional Support

The American Council on Education and other national educational organizations have within the past two years suggested the need for a new federal program of support available to all institutions for general institutional development in addition to the existing categorical and programmatic federal programs. The statewide governing and coordinating agencies, the governors, and the presidents of both private and public institutions support such a need. Of those responding to the questionnaires, one hundred and thirty-two of one hundred and forty-five presidents, twenty-eight of thirty-four governors, and twenty-five of twenty-nine state agencies see the need for federal grants for general institutional support. (See Table 37.)

The overwhelming support of the presidents does not vary to any meaningful degree on the basis of either the type of institution or type of state coordination. Table 37 does, however, reveal that five of the eight governors of states with governing boards do not support a need for this type of federal program. A ninth governor from a state with this type of coordination, whose reply is not included in the table, states merely that he "would favor consolidation of present grants." Of the other twenty-six governors, only one, from a state with a coordinating agency, does not support the need for federal grants for general institutional development. Although the major opposition to such a program is among the governors from statewide governing board states, there is no evidence that their opposition is related to the type of coordinating agency. More likely it stems from other factors such as a small state population, few institutions, the political climate of the state, or the personal convictions of the individual governors.

Among the state governing and coordinating agencies, only one of nineteen coordinating agencies, one of three state departments of education and two of seven statewide governing boards have a negative reaction to federal general institutional support grants. The one state department of education reacting negatively to such a program is in opposition to the favorable reaction of its governor, but one of the two governing boards expressing opposition is supported by the opinion of its governor. The governors of the other two states in which the state agencies express opposition did not respond to the questionnaire.

Only three governors, and none of the state agencies, made significant comments to support or to explain their responses as to the need for a general institutional support program. One governor stressed the "great need" for such a program, another observed that it "would relieve the pressures on less productive state tax sources," and the third expressed the opinion that this general support "would encourage a more orderly development of the state institutions within their approved roles and would tend to offset the disbalance of institutional programs which sometimes results from institutional responses to the enticements of available categorical federal funding."

A number of presidents, however, did supplement their answers with comments of explanation or qualification. Three presidents, two from public institutions and one from a private university, gave the strongest endorsement to such a program. One public president says, "I believe firmly that the greatest single need in the field of Federal support for higher education today is the general institutional grant which would assist the institutions to do the things that they know need to be done without dissipating their own resources in an attempt to achieve support for specific mission-oriented programs of the various federal agencies, thus tending to skew significantly in many instances the programs at the local level." Another public president affirms that "this [program] would be a major breakthrough for the support for higher education and the wisest possible investment for the nation." A private president states that the program is the "only hope for private institutions."

Several presidents, public and private, added qualifications to their endorsement of a program of general institutional support. Representative of these opinions are the following comments:

> But not at the expense of present programs.
>
> Would oppose a formula approach which did not recognize institutional differences.
>
> Only if quality or ability to perform is measured by the criteria used.
>
> Would not want Federal government to assume major support for instruction or general operations. Support for students and capital outlay is good.
>
> But only on a formula based on need. It should not result in the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. It should not pour into the one hundred largest universities.
>
> The program must require a minimum level of state support.

The following comments of two of the five private institution presidents who oppose the program express their concerns and perhaps those of other presidents of similar institutions:

> Private institutions would cease to be independent. It would be an irretrievable step to a breakdown in the distinction between public and private institutions. It would adversely affect support by alumni and others.
>
> We feel that such a program would bring the end of significant private contributions to private higher education.

Apparently those concerns are not shared, or are not shared to the same extent, by the forty-five private institution presidents who support this type of program.

Implementation of a Federal General Institutional Support Program

Although there is substantial unanimity among the statewide agencies, the governors and the presidents regarding the need for federal grants for general institutional support, the choice of a method for implementing such a program creates a considerable divergence of opinion between the state agencies and the governors on the one hand and the presidents on the other. Thirty-four of thirty-six governors and twenty-three of twenty-eight statewide governing and coordinating agencies prefer such a program to be implemented through state agencies under approved state plans. A substantial majority of the presidents, however, would prefer the program to be implemented directly between the federal agency and the individual institutions. Seventy percent of the one hundred and forty-two presidents responding to this question prefer direct implementation. As shown in Table 37, a slightly smaller percentage of the public institution presidents and a slightly higher percentage of the private institution presidents express this preference.

When the presidents' responses are categorized by type of state coordination of higher education, two interesting results are revealed. Among the presidents of public institutions, a greater percentage of the presidents in states without any formal coordinating body favor state coordination for a general institutional support program than is the case among presidents from states with any of the four types of coordination. Among the private institution presidents, a greater percentage of the presidents in states with statewide governing boards favor state coordination of such a program than do the presidents in any of the other categories based on type of state coordination. One may reasonably question whether these differences would hold in a larger sampling of the various groups.

Five of the presidents do not indicate a choice between state coordination and direct implementation. Three of the five say that either method is acceptable, that the criteria for institutional allocations are what is of primary importance, and that the criteria selected might well determine the choice as to implementation. Two presidents believe that both methods should be used, one suggesting that such grants should be made directly by a federal agency to thirty or forty major universities and that the states should allocate federal funds for this purpose to the other institutions.

Neither of the two governors who express a preference for direct implementation with individual institutions comment on the reasons for their preference. Both are governors of states with a quite limited number of institutions and one did not support the need for such a program. The comments of sixteen of the governors who prefer state coordination for the proposed program stress that the state can best determine the educational needs of the state, that institutional development must be compatible with state planning for higher education, that the state is in the best position to ensure an equitable distribution and maximum benefits, and that coordination of such funds would be essential to sound state budget management. The following comment of one governor is an example of the general feeling:

Table 37

OPINIONS ON FEDERAL GRANTS FOR GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question: The American Council on Education and other national educational organizations have recently suggested the need for a new federal program of support available to all institutions for general institutional development.

a. Do you support the need for such federal grants for general institutional development?

Responses of

Type of Coordination	Presidents Public		Presidents Private		State Governor		Governing and Coordinating Agencies	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voluntary	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	26	2	9	1	3	5	5	2
Coordinating Ag.	37	4	21	3	16	1	18	1
State Bd. of Ed.	8	0	4	0	3	0	2	1
No Formal	13	1	9	1	6	0	0	0
Totals	87	8	45	5	28	6	25	4
Total Presidents	Yes	132	No	13				

Table 37 (Continued)

b. If such a grant program were to be approved by Congress, would you prefer the program to be implemented directly with the individual institutions, or through the state coordinating agencies under approved state plans, or other?

Responses of

Type of Coordination	Presidents Public		Presidents Private		State Governor		Governing and Coordinating Agencies	
	Direct	State	Direct	State	Direct	State	Direct	State
Voluntary	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Governing Board	20	6	5	4	1	8	2	6
Coordinating Ag.	29	11	17	4	0	17	2	16
State Bd. of Ed.	5	2	4	0	0	3	1	1
No Formal	7	7	8	2	1	6	0	0
Totals	64	27	35	11	2	34	5	23
Total Presidents	Direct	99,	State	38,	Other	5.		

> The need for general institutional development varies among the states. Each state should be able to use whatever federal funds are provided to initiate a basic support program for institutional development that takes into account its own needs which may be different from those of another state. If the federal government were to deal directly with individual institutions or with a number of different agencies in a state, there would be competition among the institutions and agencies for federal support. Such competition would not necessarily take into account the institutional priorities that the State feels are consistent with its own overall planning and orderly development. Furthermore, the development of competitive application by different institutions and agencies is itself a costly duplication of effort. Also, the criteria used by the federal government in determining what programs it would support may not be compatible with criteria used by the state in its support of higher education and therefore the use of federal funds and state funds could work at cross purposes.

Another governor, who did not support the need for this type of program expresses his concern as follows:

> If [these grants] must be utilized, they should follow a carefully drawn State plan and [be] kept to a minimum lest they federalize [state's] educational institutions.

A different position is expressed by another governor who says:

> I am making a distinction here between "developmental" and "planning" grants. There is much merit in having a coordinating council or agency administer a program for comprehensive educational planning in the state. It is at this level where a coordinating body can be most effective. The initiative for institutional development, however, is best vested with the institutions to permit each institution to develop its own character. This degree of autonomy must remain with the institu-

> tion to counter any tendency towards an amorphous educational system. In this respect, developmental grants ought to be administered by the institution with widest possible discretion.

This governor, however, then adds that "this initiative can be left with a coordinating council or agency," and indicates on the questionnaire his preference for state coordinated implementation.

Among the thirty-eight presidents expressing a preference for state implementation, the comment most unqualified in support of this position states:

> The needs of education within the state would be better served if coordinated by a central state agency. Institutional needs in some cases may be better served by direct grants to institutions, however, educational programs within the state are state problems and should not be administered by individual institutions.

Many of the presidents favorable to state coordinated implementation add qualifications in their comments. Several presidents stress the necessity for federal guidelines, or federal review of state plans, to "prevent political-type administration," to "eliminate politics at the state level in allocation of funds," or to require "a minimum level of support" by the state. One president favorable to state coordination cautions:

> State administration of federal programs is entirely dependent upon the personnel staffing the coordinating office and the willingness of the institution to share in meaningful cooperative arrangements. State Administration can create serious conflicts between institutions or can contribute to valuable inter-action. The extremes are numerous.

A number of the presidents of public institutions who favor direct implementation with the institutions express a fear that state administration of the program "would create or increase state bureaucracy," that if this authority were to be given to the state's coordinating agency, it "would tend to create a superboard," and that these federal grants "would be used in lieu of state appropriations." Several private institution presidents express their concern that under state coordination of the program "criteria established at the state level would favor the public sector of education" or that "private institutions would be swallowed up or left out." One president of a large private university expresses his conviction that:

> Direct implementation of such a program between the federal government and recipient institutions is, at least insofar as private education is involved, essential if such institutions are to maintain the national or regional character of their student bodies.

The president of a similar institution states his position quite succinctly when he says "this institution is nationally oriented--not state oriented."

A number of presidents, public and private, question the expertise and understanding of the personnel in the state agencies to make the decisions inherent in administering a grant program of this nature. One president expressed this viewpoint in these terms:

> The larger, complex universities are, in fact, so complex with their own problems of specialization, coordination and development that it is impossible for an office in a state agency to plan effectively and adequately for these institutions.

Another major state university president supports direct implementation but for quite a different reason. He says that since the program "would be on a formula basis, there is no need for another administrative layer." A still different assessment is made by the president who defines the role of the state to exclude authority over an institutional development program:

> The state's participation should be limited to the coordinating function. Institutions should be free to develop and maximize individual capabilities.

Summary

The fact that more than ninety percent of the college and university presidents and more than eighty percent of the state governors and state governing and coordinating agencies endorse the need for a federal program of grants for general institutional support and development, emphasizes the high priority of such a program. The sharp division of opinion between a substantial majority of presidents who prefer direct implementation and the preponderant majority of governors and state agencies who prefer state coordination as the method for implementing the program will require frankness and understanding by all parties to negotiate an acceptable solution. As suggested by several presidents, the development of appropriate and equitable criteria for the allocation of the funds which may be appropriated by Congress for the program may largely determine the problem of implementation. The American Council on Education and the national educational associations are currently studying possible formulas which might be used as a basis for allocation of federal funds under a general support program.

A Federal Tax Remission Program for Education

Several governors and some members of Congress have suggested or advocated programs designed to return to the states some portion of the federal income tax collections. To ascertain reactions to such a program dedicated to the support of education in the several states, governors, statewide governing and coordinating agencies for higher education, and presidents were queried on questions pertinent to such a program. The following sections summarize and discuss the reactions of these three groups to the specific questions posed. A tabulation of the responses is given in Table 38.

General Support for a Tax Remission Program for Education

A majority of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies and a substantial majority of the governors responding to the questionnaires favor the general proposition of a tax remission program for education, but the college and university presidents, as a group, are quite divided in their opinion of such a program.

Among the twenty-nine statewide agencies, fifteen favor a program of this type, eleven do not, and three give a qualified answer. One of the latter three respondents would support the program only if it were limited to public institutions, another only if the legislation "clearly mandated the funds for educational use only," and the third reserved opinion "until implications of the plan can be assessed." Although the coordinating agencies favor the proposal by about a two-to-one majority, and two of the three state boards of education responding have the same opinion, four of the seven governing boards are opposed.

Among the thirty-four governors responding, twenty-one favor the proposed program, eleven oppose it and two give other responses. One of the latter two governors says that he favors a "Federal aid program based on need of the states," and the other indicates that "the issue of revenue sharing requires further study in evaluating [its] total effects." The major support for the proposal comes from the governors of states with coordinating agencies. Two of the three governors of states with state board of education authority for higher education oppose the idea; the governors of states with no formal coordinating or governing body are equally divided; and only a bare majority of governors in states with governing boards favor the proposal.

Three of the governors (two from states with coordinating agencies and one from a state without a formal coordinating body) who indicate support for a tax remission program add the qualification that it not be limited to support of education. One governor favors the general concept but states that "some plans are unacceptable," while another adds the following qualification:

> I favor such a program if it is understood
> that the state will receive aid based on
> its own college-going population and the
> number of non-state residents it educates.

A governor who opposes the tax remission concept states that "this would encourage further encroachment on the taxing powers of the states." The opinion that "tax remission programs (those currently proposed) discriminate against [his state]" is given as the basis for another negative response.

Of the one hundred and thirty-seven presidents responding to the question as to their opinion of a tax remission program for education, fifty-four favor such a program, sixty-six oppose it, and seventeen give other responses. These seventeen "other" responses break down as follows: four "don't know"; one says "no comment"; five are "doubtful"; two say that their answer would depend upon the "specifics" or "nature" of the proposal; three indicate that they would support the program "only if in addition to state investment," "only if all institutions are included," and "only if there were provisions leading toward enhancement of a national purpose"; and two support tax remission for all state programs, "not just education."

An analysis of the presidents' responses in Table 38 reveals greater opposition to a tax remission program among presidents of private institutions than among public institution presidents. In the latter group, forty-one favor the program, thirty-eight oppose it, and eight give other answers. By comparison, among private institution presidents only thirteen are favorable, twenty-eight are opposed, and nine express other opinions. Greatest opposition to the proposed program comes from both public and private institution presidents in states with coordinating agencies (a majority of the public presidents and a substantial majority of the private presidents). This general reaction is in sharp contrast to the opinions of the governors and statewide agencies in states with this type of coordination. As previously noted, these groups are the source of the greatest support for a tax remission program.

The comments of a number of the presidents reveal the concerns which motivate their replies. Interestingly, almost all of the comments are from presidents who oppose the proposed program. One comment succinctly identifies the "two problems" with which all of the comments are concerned, i.e., "(1) equalization between the states and (2) private education." The problem of equalization is most frequently mentioned. Both a public institution president and a private institution president say that federal support of this nature should not be used for private institutions. The latter then expresses support for a tax credit program. One president states simply that he does not "believe in the feasibility of a broad-based tax remission plan," and another states his preference for a general institutional grant program.

Three somewhat different comments are deserving of quotation:

A president of a large, Midwestern university:

> Tax remission here is interpreted as a return to the specific state of a portion of tax paid by that state to the Federal Government. Unless apportioned centrally and from the point of view of the National good, the wealthy states would be developing ever superior educational institutions while the poorer ones would relatively be condemned to just the opposite. A guarantee against such an adverse and unhappy development is not included in the reference to "tax remission"; therefore, the "no" answer.

A president of a Southern public university:

> We are inclined to believe that a program of tax remission, like an institutional grant program administered by a state agency, would result in the withdrawal of comparable sums of state tax monies from institutions of higher education. We are in need of more support for higher education in [his state] not of generally the same support from a different tax source.

A president of a large private university in the Northeast:

> For the purpose of this question we are treating "tax remission" as equivalent to tax sharing and as including not only plans following the Heller-Pechman proposal (per capita revenue sharing with no strings attached, and over and above categorical federal grants) but also variations such as those embodied in such bills as HR 4070 (Godell) HR 5450 (Laird), S. 482 (Javits), HR 1166 (Reuss), and S. 673 (Tydings).
>
> We do not favor a program of tax remission, at least at this time, for the following reasons:

1. The effect of such a program could vary quite widely depending on the specific program adopted and is therefore impossible to evaluate in the abstract. For example, the foregoing bills are only a limited sampling but vary widely in terms of the extent to which Federal control would be exercised over the disbursement of the funds, the state's latitude in determining the uses to which the funds could be put even within specified fields such as education, the extent to which the Federal funds are conditioned on an acceptable state tax effort, whether or not state or local governmental reforms are required, whether taxable income or revenue should be the base, and the extent to which the Federal funds are equalized to favor states with low per capita income or large urban populations. Without knowing the specifics of such a program it is impossible to evaluate its effect on higher as opposed to elementary and secondary education, or on private as opposed to public higher education.

2. Presumably an important goal of such a plan is to strengthen the role of the states as catalysts in cooperative planning and action involving local, state, and federal levels by providing more flexibility and discretion in the use of Federal funds. We feel that at this point a tax remission program is premature and that the same goal can be better achieved by the following steps:

a. Moving to end the confusion, duplication, and lack of coordination in the Federal grant system by consolidating the numerous categorical grant programs into roughly one-fourth the number of categorical programs, and continuing to award these to the states, to local governments, or to private organizations.

b. In addition to the foregoing, providing for a lesser number of block-grants to be made directly to the states in functional areas of which elementary-secondary education could be one.

c. Strengthening efforts to involve states in policy planning for Federal assistance programs, evaluating legislation before it starts through the Congress, and developing program implementation; and finding better means of providing Federal funds in a manner compatible with state budgeting and fiscal procedures.

After the foregoing steps have been taken, we could better evaluate the capacity of the states to respond to greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds; the success of the states in improving planning and coordination and solving the problems of fragmented local jurisdictions, regions, commission, etc.; the effect of which the reapportionment of state legislatures is likely to have on the manner in which the states internally distribute federal funds; and whether the states can increase their tax effort and revenues by such other means as, for example, a tax credit plan under which taxpayers would deduct a portion of their state income tax payments from their federal tax obligation.

3. We oppose such a program insofar as it would apply to all levels of education including higher education.

Support provided by or via the state, whether by tax remission or unrestricted block grants, would present disadvantages for private institutions wishing to maintain the national or regional character of their student bodies since not every state legislature or other body can be expected to willingly provide support to out-of-state students. In addition, private institutions must retain freedom to protect their standards by refusing to admit more students, and by maintaining faculty salaries and student-faculty ratios at appropriate levels not necessarily comparable to those at public institutions. This freedom is likely to be subjected to pressure proportionate to institutional dependence on state funds.

In addition, a tax remission plan which included private education would interfere with development of a Federal program for insti-

Table 38

OPINIONS ON TAX REMISSION TO STATES FOR EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT

Question: A number of Governors, and some members of Congress, have advocated a program of tax remission from the Federal government to the states. One suggestion is that such a tax remission program be dedicated to the support of all levels of education in the several states.

a. Do you, in general, favor such a program of tax remission to support the educational activities of the state?

Type of Coordination	Presidents Public			Presidents Private			Governors			Governing and Coord. Agencies		
	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.
Voluntary	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
Governing Bd.	13	7	2	2	4	1	5	4	0	2	4	1
Coordinating Ag.	16	19	5	4	18	4	12	2	2	11	6	2
State Bd. of Ed.	4	3	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	1	0
No Formal	7	8	1	5	3	2	3	3	0	-	-	-
Total	41	38	8	13	28	9	21	11	2	15	11	3
		87			50			34			29	

Total Presidents Yes 54, No 66, Other 17 -- 137

b. Would you favor such a program if it were in lieu of all other types of federal grants to education?

Type of Coordination	Presidents Public			Presidents Private			Governors			Governing and Coord. Agencies		
	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.
Voluntary	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
Governing Bd.	4	18	0	1	6	0	6	3	0	2	5	0
Coordinating Ag.	3	36	0	0	24	2	5	4	4	7	12	0
State Bd. of Ed.	2	5	0	2	4	0	1	2	0	3	0	0
No Formal	1	13	2	2	6	0	3	3	0	-	-	-
Total	10	74	2	5	41	2	15	12	4	12	17	0
		86			48			31			29	

Total Presidents Yes 15, No 115, Other 4 -- 134

Table 38 (Continued)

d. Would a tax remission program in support of education in the several states encourage and abet state planning and coordinating activites in the field of higher education?

Type of Coordination	Presidents Public			Presidents Private			Governors			Governing and Coord. Agencies		
	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.	Yes	No	Oth.
Voluntary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
Governing Bd.	12	2	5	4	2	0	4	1	2	2	2	1
Coordinating Ag.	15	12	4	6	6	5	14	1	0	10	3	4
State Bd. of Ed.	2	4	1	2	1	3	1	1	0	2	0	1
No Formal	10	1	3	5	1	1	2	3	1	-	-	-
Total	39	19	13	17	10	9	21	6	3	14	5	6
	71			36			30			25		

Total Presidents Yes 56, No 29, Other 22 -- 107

e. Would a tax remission program for educational purposes materially affect the autonomy of non-public institutions?

Type of Coordination	Presidents Public				Presidents Private				Governors				Governing and Coord. Agencies			
	Yes	No	*	Oth.	Yes	No	*	Oth.	Yes	No	*	Oth.	Yes	No	*	Oth.
Voluntary	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-
Governing Bd.	6	3	10	1	1	1	5	0	2	2	3	0	2	2	0	0
Coordinating Ag.	17	5	7	2	16	1	5	1	0	3	12	0	5	2	12	0
State Bd. of Ed.	1	2	4	0	3	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0
No Formal	5	3	5	2	2	2	4	0	2	2	2	0	-	-	-	-
Total	29	13	26	5	23	4	15	2	4	9	17	0	7	6	13	0
	73				44				30				26			

Total Presidents Yes 52, No 17, Tendency, but 41 Other 7 -- 117

*This would be the tendency, but an appropriate, carefully drawn state plan would minimize such effect.

Table 38 (Continued)

f. Does your state constitution pose serious problems to the inclusion of private institutions, especially church-related colleges and universities, under a plan of state support based on a tax remission program by the federal government?

Type of Coordination	Presidents Public				Presidents Private				Governors				State Agencies			
	Yes	No	*	Oth.	Yes	No	*	Oth.	Yes	No	*	Oth.	Yes	No	*	Oth.
Voluntary	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-
Governing Bd.	7	3	9	2	1	2	4	0	4	0	2	2	5	0	0	0
Coordinating Ag.	18	2	13	0	18	2	5	1	5	2	2	3	12	0	5	1
State Bd. of Ed.	2	2	4	0	3	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
No Formal	6	5	3	0	3	1	4	0	4	0	2	0	-	-	-	-
Total	33	12	29	3	25	6	13	3	14	3	7	5	18	1	5	2
	77				47				29				26			

Total Presidents Yes 58, No 18, Don't know 42, Other 6 -- 124

*I don't know

tutional support such as that discussed
above under question 20.

Tax Remission to the States in Lieu of Other Federal Aid to Education

A majority of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies join an overwhelming majority of the presidents in opposition to the suggestion that a tax remission program should be substituted for all other federal aid programs as the sole source of federal support for education. A majority of the governors who have formed a definite opinion, however, would favor such a consolidation of federal aid.

The twenty-nine state agencies responding oppose the idea of complete consolidation of federal aid by a seventeen to twelve majority, with a majority of both the governing boards and the coordinating agencies in opposition but with all three state boards of education expressing a favorable reaction. (See Table 38 for tabulation of responses.) Among the one hundred and thirty-four presidents responding, one hundred and fifteen oppose and only fifteen favor a tax remission program in lieu of all other federal aid. Four presidents are undecided. Fifteen of the thirty governors expressing an opinion are favorable to the idea, twelve express opposition, and four indicate either that further study is required or that their position would depend upon the scope and limitations of the tax remission program.

Although none of the fifteen governors favoring a tax remission program in lieu of all other federal support commented on their specific answers to this question, their motivation is not difficult to surmise. These governors probably see a tax remission program as the source of materially greater state revenues with decisions as to expenditure of these increased funds primarily a matter of state determination of needs and priorities. Institutional presidents, public as well as private, are concerned about this very possibility. They fear the increased power and control of the state as the sole governmental funding agency and the loss of institutional flexibility which multi-agency funding provides. The comments of one statewide agency and one governor that there are many national concerns and purposes directly related to education which can be implemented only by categorical programs undoubtedly reflect the opinion of most of those (governors, presidents and agencies) who oppose an all-inclusive federal tax remission program.

Federal Programs in Addition to a Tax Remission Program

Those governors, statewide agencies and presidents who do not favor a tax remission program in lieu of all other federal programs were asked to indicate the types of federal programs which Congress should support in the event a tax remission program should be enacted.

Nine of the twelve governors expressing this opinion responded as follows:

1. Research, loans, and student aid.
2. NSF, NIH and other highly specialized grants given in the interests of increasing the nation's capabilities in the sciences and health.
3. Programs to elicit needed change from a national point of view.
4. Research grants to individual investigation; work study programs and NDEA loans.
5. Should not affect the types of federal programs supported by Congress.
6. Higher education facilities and student loans.
7. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Higher Education Act of 1965; Appalachia Act of 1965.
8. NSF scholarship and fellowship aids; NIH programs of general and project support.
9. Many research programs, NSF type programs, programs to support the sciences, medicine and agriculture, health programs generally, space-related programs, and programs to meet national needs.

Nine of the seventeen statewide agencies taking this position gave the following answers:

1. Research grants; instructional grants relevent to national needs; student support programs.
2. Research.
3. No change from present.
4. NSF, NIH, direct support of research.
5. Buildings and facilities programs.
6. Programs of high national priority.
7. Educational planning; facilities; assistance to students.

8. Scholarships; Facilities Act

9. Research; special programs of national concern.

Seventy-three of the one hundred and fifteen presidents who oppose a tax remission program in lieu of all other federal programs listed the types of federal programs which in their opinion should be separately supported. These responses are listed in the Appendix and are summarized below:

Programs Most Frequently Listed
by Presidents

(Does not include all programs listed)

Program	Frequency
Research (variously categorized)	36
Facilities	12
All existing programs	11
Land Grant programs	8
Graduate, or graduate and professional	7
Student aid (variously defined)	6
Programs to accomplish national objectives	2
Developing institution	2
International program	2
All which apply to private institutions	2

In each of these three listings there is quite apparently a primary emphasis on the need for continued categorical or programmatic support in the areas of research and facilities, and a somewhat lesser recognition of the need to provide support for students and to meet specific national objectives. No substantial divergence of opinion exists between the three groups.

A Tax Remission Program as an Encouragement to State Planning And Coordination of Higher Education

The general feeling of governors, statewide governing and coordinating agencies, and presidents is that a tax remission program which would provide substantial funds to the states for educational purposes would be an encouragement to state planning and coordination of higher education in the several states. Fourteen of the state governing and coordinating agencies, the group most directly affected, take this position, but five do not believe that this would be the effect and another six are doubtful or undecided. Of the latter group, two say that they do not know what this effect would be, two do not believe that the program would "necessarily" have this effect, one says that the result "depends upon where control is," and another that such encouragement would "not automatically" result, "but if it doesn't, states are forfeiting a major obligation."

Twenty-one of the thirty governors expressing an opinion believe that a tax remission program would encourage state planning and coordination, six do not, and three give other responses. One of these three governors states that "any such program should have such planning as a prerequisite"; another believes that state planning and coordination would not be encouraged "unless the state and federal administrative requirements focused in that direction"; and the third says that he doesn't know.

Only one hundred and seven of the presidents responded to this question, and of this number fifty-six believe that state planning and coordination would be encouraged, twenty-nine do not, and twenty-two give other answers. Thirteen of this latter group of presidents indicate their uncertainty by responses such as "not necessarily," "probably," " probably not," "it could," and "I don't know." Others in this group believe that the effect on state planning and coordination would depend "on the specifics of the legislation" or "upon the climate of cooperation in each state," or that such activities would be encouraged only if "required" or "left out of politics." One president cautioned that the program "would probably abet state planning but would not guarantee its quality or effectiveness," and in the opinion of another it "would create greater state bureaucracy."

Three of the public institution presidents who express the opinion that state planning and coordination would be encouraged reveal their negative attitude toward these state activities by commenting that such encouragement would perhaps be to the "detriment of individual institutions," that "it [the program] could retard meaningful planning," and that such encouragement is "what is wrong with the program."

Effect of a Tax Remission Program on the Autonomy of Non-Public Institutions

A troublesome but important question pertinent to the consideration of any program involving the inclusion of private colleges and universities in state planning, development and coordination of higher education is the possible impact on the autonomy of these institutions. As private institutions become more and more dependent on government support--federal or state--the preservation of their individual autonomy is a very real concern to all who value the pluralistic system of education in this country. To assess the possible effect on private institutions of a tax remission program to the states, the governors, statewide governing and coordinating agencies, and presidents were asked whether such a program would materially affect the autonomy of these institutions.

A substantial majority of each of these groups believe either that such a program would have a material effect on the autonomy of private institutions, or that it would have this tendency but that this effect could be minimized by an appropriate, carefully drawn state plan. Four of the governors express the former opinion and seventeen the latter. Nine governors feel that the program would not materially affect the autonomy of the private institutions. Among the twenty-six statewide agencies answering this question, seven believe that there would be a material effect, thirteen see this as a tendency which could be minimized by an appropriate state plan, and six do not believe that the private institutions would be materially affected.

The governor of a state with a strong coordinating agency comments that "it is possible to have central state coordination of higher education and still allow a very high degree of institutional (public and private) autonomy." Another governor, from a state with state board of education responsibility for higher education, indicates that a tax remission program would not materially affect the autonomy of private institutions "assuming other Federal education aids were still provided non-public institutions." A governor of a state with an advisory coordinating agency compares the impact of a tax remission program on institutional autonomy with the present categorical federal aid programs as follows:

> In my opinion, tax remission would not materially affect the autonomy of non-public institutions in the several states. It is possible that a state plan could be drawn that would affect the autonomy of any institutions. I believe, however, that the piece-meal grants from the federal government are more likely to affect the autonomy of institutions which adapt to the requirements of the federal grant than would be the case if federal tax remission were provided which could then be administered on a broad base at the state level.

The presidents, especially the private institution presidents, see a greater danger to the autonomy of the private institutions than do the other two groups. Of the presidents responding, forty percent of the public institution presidents and a small majority of the private institution presidents believe that the autonomy of the private institutions would be materially affected. In addition, about a third of the private presidents and a slightly higher proportion of the public presidents believe that this would be the tendency but that an appropriate, carefully drawn state plan would minimize this effect. Less than twenty percent of the public presidents and fewer than ten percent of the private presidents (four in number) believe that a tax remission program involving the private institutions would have no impact on the autonomy of these institutions. Seven presidents, five public and two private, give other responses which indicate their uncertainty as to the effect of such a program.

Among the private institution presidents, a much higher proportion of the presidents from states with coordinating agencies and states with state board of education responsibility for higher education predict a material impact on the autonomy of private institutions than do presidents from states with other forms of coordination. Only in these two categories does the number of private presidents predicting a material impact exceed the number who believe either that there would not be a material effect or that such an effect could be minimized. Among the public institution presidents, only in the group from states with coordinating agencies is there a majority of presidents who believe that a tax remission program would materially affect the autonomy of private institutions. The reactions of the presidents, private and public, from states with coordinating agencies is yet another reflection of the still uncertain position of many coordinating agencies in the structure of higher education governance and the ambivalence of the presidents' attitudes toward these agencies. A pertinent question would be whether a larger sample of presidents' opinions, especially in the private sector, would produce results materially different from those obtained in the study.

Clearly, a much larger proportion of the presidents, especially the presidents of private institutions, than of the governors and state agencies is apprehensive concerning the possible impact of a program of tax remission to the states on the autonomy of the private institutions. This concern of the private institution presidents is certainly not surprising, but what is surprising is the number of these presidents who believe that the impact on institutional autonomy would be only a tendency which could be minimized by an appropriate state plan. Could it be that the financial straits of many of the private institutions are so great that the possibility for substantial, increased support through such a program outweighs their concern about receiving this aid from the state? Are many of the private institution presidents realistically reconciled to increased state involvement? Or are they convinced that the development of a state plan which would provide funds (allocated by the federal government to the state) to the private institutions on an equitable basis and without controls or supervision which would seriously impair their individuality or autonomy is both feasible from the political viewpoint and realistic from the academic standpoint?

State Constitutional Provisions Affecting the Inclusion of Private Institutions in a Tax Remission Program

Although the effect of a state constitutional provision on the use of tax funds remitted to the states for aid to private institutions is a legal question on which the governors, directors of statewide agencies and presidents may not have the special expertise, these three groups were neverthless queried as to whether their state consitutions pose serious problems to the inclusion of private institutions, especially church-related colleges and universities, under a plan of state support based on a tax remission program by federal government.

Of those responding to this question, a large majority of the state agencies, half of the governors, and a plurality of the presidents are of the opinion that their state constitutions do pose serious problems in regard to private institutions sharing under such a program. (See Table 38.) A small number in each group have the opposite opinion, a few express their uncertainty, and a larger number say that they do not know whether or not there is a problem.

Several of the governors, two presidents and a state agency comment that the method used in channeling the federal funds to the institutions would determine whether a state consitutional question would be involved. One governor states that "if funds were classified as federal funds to be distributed by the state, there would be no problem" but "if these funds were allocated to the state treasury, a problem could exist on distribution to church-related colleges and universities." Another governor says that his state constitution "prohibits use of state funds, but would not prohibit channeling of Federal funds through [the] state for distribution to private institutions." A somewhat broader statement of the alternative is contained in the governor's comment which states:

> The question of whether there would be serious constitutional problems in the administration of these funds would depend upon goals, objectives and purposes as declared by Congress for which the monies are to be used and administered. The exact question would be whether Congress retains through some Federal Administrative agency supervisory control over the purposes for which the money may be used or whether it is to be co-mingled with State funds in the State Treasury, to be used for lawful purposes as defined in the State Constitution and statutes. If the money goes into the general State Treasury to be used by the State for State purposes, as defined by its Constitution and statutes, the question of the constitutionality of the use of these funds for private institutions could be raised.
>
> The Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IVB, Guaranteed Loan Program, due to State Constitutional limitations, is administered by a non-profit corporation in the State formed for the specific purpose of the administration of this program.

A few respondents expressed a preference for a "tax credit" program instead of a tax remission program to the states. One governor expresses his opinion as follows:

> If the tax remission was remitted directly to individual state taxpayers so they could exercise choice in attending educational institutions, I do not foresee great problems. However, if the remission discussed here is a type of "block grant" received by the state treasury, serious problems may be raised.

A Midwestern governor suggests a possible partial solution which might still leave unresolved the problem of the church-related institutions:

> We probably could expend state funds through contractual arrangements with private institutions for educational services. We already provide extensive scholarship and grant programs to students who may attend either public or private institutions. The constitution forbids aid to church related institutions only.

The comments of institutional presidents on this question vary from the statement of one public institution president that he does not believe in state support of church-related institutions and of another that "tax support should not be used for private schools" to the statement of a private institution president that he "favor[s] federal effort on this [program] as a means of getting [the] state consitution changed." One public institution president states that "support for private institutions should be separately provided" and another suggests that "perhaps the only way for the federal government to significantly assist the private institutions would be as a form of scholarship grant given to the individual who chose to attend such institutions in lieu of other federal support coming to the public institutions." An alternative solution suggested by a private institution president is an "income tax credit program balanced with an expanded scholarship program." Several presidents, public and private, expressed their preference for a general institutional grant program rather than a tax remission program.

These comments which show the diverse views of some members of the public and private sectors are neither new or unique but merely reflect some of the positions which have been expounded in connection with various proposals for federal or state assistance to private institutions. The necessity for increased support for private institutions is almost universally recognized but the appropriate means or methods for providing this aid are concerns on which there is great divergence of opinion. This wide diversity is clearly revealed in the analysis of responses in this and the previous section.

Summary

Among the three groups queried--governors, state governing and coordinating agencies, and presidents--there is considerably less unanimity of support for a federal tax remission program to the states for education than was expressed for a general institutional grant program. This is particularly true among the presidents and especially among the presidents of private institutions. Only the governors give majority support (fifteen of the twenty-seven expressing a definite opinion) to a tax remission program if it were in lieu of all other types of federal grants to education. A majority of the state agencies and an overwhelming majority of the presidents are opposed to such a substitution. In the event of Congressional enactment of a tax remission program for education the types of programs most frequently listed by the presidents as those which should continue to be separately supported included research, facilities, "all existing programs," Land Grant, graduate and professional, and student aid. The state agencies and the governors not only list research, facilities and student aid, but also give greater proportional recognition to the necessity for continuing support for programs involving national interests.

Although a majority of all three groups believe that a tax remission program would encourage state planning and coordination of higher education, some of the presidents, both public and private, are critical or apprehensive of such a result.

Two questions were directed to the impact of a tax remission program as it would relate to the private sector of higher education. A majority of the presidents of private institutions believe that the program would materially affect the autonomy of private institutions, and most of the other private presidents believe that this would be the tendency but that a carefully drawn state plan would minimize this effect. The latter view is held by half of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies and by a majority of the governors. A substantial majority of those in each of the groups who have a definite opinion believe that their state constitutions pose a serious problem to the inclusion of private institutions, especially church-related institutions, under a tax remission program. Several of the governors suggest that these state constitutional problems could be avoided by channeling funds directly from a federal agency to the institutions, but under state plans which would determine the allocations to be made. While such a plan might be a possible solution to the constitutional problems involved, the question as to the extent to which the private institutions would come under the influence and control of the state agencies responsible for determining the institutional needs and priorities within the state plans would remain.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During recent years the federal government has become increasingly involved in programs designed to improve the health, education and general welfare of its citizens. Many of these programs are in areas previously considered to be the primary obligations of state and local governments or in areas in which the broader responsibilities of the federal government overlap the local obligations of states and communities.

As these federal programs have increased in number, scope and size, an increasing number of state governors and members of state legislatures have voiced demands for a greater involvement of state government in their planning and implementation. The arguments are made that since the states have either primary or joint responsibility in the areas covered by these programs and in many of the programs are required to provide matching funds, they should have a participating role in their implementation; that without coordination of federal and state efforts the total impact of parallel programs may not be as great or that discordant efforts which may thwart the attainment of basic mutual goals may result; and that, without a state voice in determining policies and priorities, unique local needs and conditions may be overlooked or different objectives pursued.

Higher education is one of the areas for which this demand for a federal-state partnership in federal assistance programs has been made. In the field of higher education, the states have primary repponsibility for providing educational opportunities for an increasing majority of the college-age population. On the other hand, the federal government has become increasingly aware that improvement of the education of its citizens is essential to the general national interest and that the attainment of national objectives related to the improvement of the health and welfare of its people, to the scientific and industrial development of the nation, and to the national defense depend to a substantial degree upon tapping the existing resources of our educational institutions and improving and expanding the institutions which provide these resources.

To meet these responsibilities and objectives, both the states and the federal government have increased manyfold their investments in higher education. The states have expanded the size and scope of existing institutions and have created new institutions to meet the needs of rapidly increasing enrollments, and they have provided increased resources to improve the quality of their educational programs. Concurrently, the federal government, through a myriad of federal programs, has provided support for students and individual faculty, supported and encouraged research, provided funds for improving the quality of institutional programs, funded institutional projects for the improvement of teaching, for improvement of library resources and for other educational innovations, and provided grants and low-interest loans for capital improvements. The states have provided the general operating funds for their institutions whereas federal support has been basically categorical and programmatic.

Prior to 1963, all of these federal programs were implemented directly between federal agencies and individual institutions. The states, which provided the basic budgetary support for their state institutions, had little voice in the allocation of federal funds to their institutions, but they were faced with the demands of the institutions for matching state funds required by many of the federal programs or for state funds to maintain support levels achieved with federal funds. In 1963, with the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act, Congress for the first time provided a role for the states in the administration and implementation of a federal program in aid of higher education. In Title I, providing grants for undergraduate facilities, funds appropriated by the Congress are allocated to the states to be administered by a state agency under a state plan. Although the Act prescribes general criteria for the state plan, the states are left some flexibility within the general framework to adapt the state plan to state needs or priorities. In 1965, in the Higher Education Act, Congress provided a similar role for the states in Title I, Community Services and Continuing Education, and Title VI A, Undergraduate Equipment. A similar provision was incorporated in the State Technical Services Act of 1965. In these recent acts, Congress has, to some extent, met the demands of the states for some voice and participation in the federal programs in aid of education.

The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of these various federal programs in aid of higher education on the function of the states in planning and coordinating and the development of higher education in their states, and to examine the implications of this assessment for future federal programs. It has attempted to answer such questions as the following: What has been the effect of the federal programs implemented directly with the institutions and of the state-coordinated federal programs on the state planning and coordinating function in higher education? Have the great number of direct, categorical-type programs made substantially more difficult the state's efforts toward an orderly development of its institutions to provide reasonably for the educational needs of the state? What should be the future direction of federal programs regarding the role of the state? Should the state be given a part in the administration and implementation of all existing and new federal programs; or are there acceptable criteria which can reasonably determine those programs which should be implemented solely between the federal agencies and the institutions and those which should be administered through state agencies? What effect do the state-coordinated federal programs have on the private institutions and what would be the effect on these institutions of an extension of state coordination to other federal programs?

The approach of this study to these and other related questions has been to obtain and analyze information and opinions from those most directly affected: governors, statewide governing and coordinating agencies, special state agencies or general academic institutions administering federal programs, and presidents of senior institutions of higher education.

In assessing the impact of directly-implemented and state-coordinated federal programs on state planning and coordination of higher education, consideration of two distinct factors is essential. First, the nature of the state planning and coordinating organization is important because the extent of the effect of the federal programs may depend, at least to some extent, upon the role and authority of that organization. At the time of the survey, thirteen states had statewide governing boards responsible for all, or all senior, institutions, twenty-one states had coordinating agencies, with varying degrees of authority, interposed between institutional or system governing boards and state government; one state had a form of limited voluntary coordination; four states had state boards of education with some responsibility for state instituions of higher education; and eleven states had no formal statewide organization for the governance or coordination of higher education. The information and opinions obtained in this survey are analyzed on the basis of the type of coordination, if any, existing in the states from which the responses originate and on the basis of the type of state organization (i.e., governing or coordinating agency, special state agency, or academic institution) administering the federal programs.

The second factor to be considered is the general interests of the institutions in state planning and coordination of higher education as that function may be affected by the state-coordinated federal programs. Because the institutions are the instrumentalities through which educational opportunities are offered, the reactions of the institutions as expressed by their presidents are pertinent to the assessment of programs which directly or indirectly affect their educational role or institutional autonomy. This study gives considerable attention to the opinions of the presidents and analyzes their reactions on the basis of the type or nature of their instituions. The responses of presidents of private (non-state supported) institutions are compared with the opinions expressed by public institution presidents, and where meaningful, a further comparison is made of responses from doctoral-granting institutions and those from institutions without doctoral programs.

The Effect on State Planning and Coordination of Federal Programs Implemented Directly With Institutions

A majority of the governors do not regard the direct federal programs as a source of substantial problems for the states' coordinating activities. This is also the opinion of a majority of the state boards of education and most of the governing boards, but a majority of the coordinating boards believe that to some extent the direct federal programs have made state planning and coordination of higher education more difficult.

Those governors and state agencies taking the position that the direct federal programs have caused difficulties in state planning and coordination emphasize three problem areas: (1) the existence of substantial funds in the hands of the instituions for which they are not directly accountable to state government; (2) institutional initiation of programs which commit the state to provide matching funds or to maintain with state funds increased support levels established by federal funds; and (3) federal support of institutional programs or facilities which may not be consistent with state planning.

The fact that a majority of the governors, state boards of education and governing boards do not regard the direct federal programs as a substantial detriment to state coordination does not, of course, meet the issues raised by those who hold the opposite opinion. Neither does the fact that responsible state officials in a number of states believe that the direct federal programs have made coordination of higher education substantially more difficult necessarily lead to the conclusion that direct access by educational institutions to federal agencies for supporting grants should be eliminated or curtailed, particularly in view of what these types of grants have meant to the institutions, their faculties and their students.

The Effect of State-Coordinated Federal Programs

Impact on the State Organizational Structure for Higher Education

Effect on Organization and Function of Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies

Except in a few states, the state-coordinated programs in higher education have had little effect on changes in the organization and authority of state governing and coordinating agencies, and there is little evidence that they have influenced to any appreciable extent the establishment of the new coordinating agencies created since 1963.

Effect on Stature and Influence of Governing and Coordinating Agencies

Apparently, from the viewpoint of both the governors and the agencies themselves, the responsibility for administering the state-coordinated federal programs has had a considerable impact in increasing the influence and stature of the statewide governing and coordinating agencies; and apparently this effect has been somewhat greater for the coordinating agencies and the state boards of education than for the statewide governing boards.

The nature of this favorable impact is related to the new relationship with private institutions, to the increased leadership role provided, to the strengthening of the planning function, and to the "natural tendency to take more seriously an agency with funds to allocate."

Effect on Relationship of Governing and Coordinating Agencies With State Government

The statewide governing boards responsible for one or more of the state-coordinated federal programs do not see that their administration of these programs has affected materially their relationship with state government. Although a majority of the coordinating boards share the same opinion, an appreciable number believe that their responsibility for these programs has favorably affected this relationship.

Impact on State Function of Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

When Administered by the Governing and Coordinating Agencies

Most of the general governing and coordinating agencies responsible for one or more of the state-coordinated federal programs view their administration of the programs for which they are responsible as supportive of their general planning and coordinating functions, but proportionately more of these agencies that administer the facilities program regard it as being of substantial assistance than do those (including those administering the facilities program) that administer the other programs.

In their appraisal of each of the federal programs for which they are responsible, not one of the governing and coordinating agencies indicates that this responsibility has detracted from their general planning and coordinating activities, and in their appraisal of the overall effect of their administrative responsibility for federal programs, only one agency sees an adverse impact on these functions.

Those that assess the administration of the federal programs as supportive of their general responsibilities believe that these programs have: (1) provided the opportunity to integrate state programs and goals with federal programs and goals, (2) provided some specific bases for role assignment through the necessity for deciding priorities, (3) facilitated and focused on planning programs for facilities and program development, (4) complemented their existing functions and activities and provided added importance to these activities, (5) brought about closer involvement of the private institutions and made the agency more acceptable to them by the help it provides, (6) resulted in participation of all public and private institutions in statewide planning, and (7) provided additional staff for planning and coordination.

General Impact on State Planning and Coordination

A majority of the governors and a substantial majority of the presidents believe that the state-coordinated federal programs have contributed to state planning and coordination. Except in the states without formal coordinating organizations, a larger proportion of the private presidents than the public presidents share this opinion.

In general, both the governors and the presidents believe that these federal programs have made contributions in one or more of the following ways: (1) they have created or contributed to an environment conducive to statewide planning and coordination, (2) activities of the statewide advisory committees for the programs have enhanced broad consideration of statewide educational problems and opportunities, and (3) they have increased the availability and dissemination of comparable information or statistical data. The specific instances given of enhanced planning and coordination are quite varied but emphasize the encouragement and assistance to state planning and the inclusion of the private sector in state planning.

Most of the governing and coordinating agencies believe that the state-coordinated federal programs, however administered, have supported state planning and coordination, and an even greater majority indicate that none of the federal programs, however administered, have impeded substantially the performance of these general state functions.

The governing boards and state boards of education with coordinating responsibilities do not believe that either the assignment of a particular federal program to another agency or institution or the assignment of two or more of the programs to other agencies or institutions has adversely affected their own general planning and coordinating efforts, but a majority of the coordinating boards believe that their efforts in these areas have been adversely affected in both instances. Consequently, the coordinating boards, but not the governing boards and state boards of education, would favor concentrating the administration of all the state-coordinated federal programs under their own direction.

A majority of the governors are of the opinion that consolidation of the administration of the four federal programs in their general governing or coordinating agencies would enhance state planning and coordination, but almost all of the special state agencies and the institutions administering these programs are opposed to relinquishing their authority to the general state agency.

The presidents who express a definite opinion as to the desirability for concentrating the administration of the federal programs in their governing or coordinating agencies are quite evenly divided, with only a slight majority opposing consolidation, but an appreciable number indicate that the assignment of administrative responsibility makes no significant difference to them. The presidents in governing board states, especially the private institution presidents, either generally favor consolidation or are not opposed to it. In contrast, the presidents in coordinating board states generally oppose the concentration of administrative responsibility for the four programs in that agency.

Impact on Relationships Between Public and Private Institutions

A majority of the statewide governing boards and of the state boards of education administering one or more of the federal programs do not believe that their responsibility for these programs has affected materially the relationships between the public and private institutions, but a majority of the coordinating agencies believe that their administration of the programs has had a favorable effect on the relationships between the two sectors.

A substantial majority of the presidents do not see that there has been any improvement in the relationship between institutions in the public and private sectors as a result of the state-coordinated federal programs; however, in the governing board and coordinating board states a number of presidents are undecided and the public presidents in the former states and all presidents in the latter states are closely divided in their opinions.

Institutional Reactions and Preferences

Presidents' Appraisals of the State-Coordinated Programs

The general reaction of the institutional presidents as a group and of the public and private presidents as separate groups to the concept of state coordination for the existing federal programs is predominantly favorable. Most significant is that not a single president believes that there is general disapproval of state coordination for these programs.

Among the public presidents proportionately more of those in state board of education states and in coordinating board states believe that there is either general doubt and apprehension concerning state coordination or that there is institutional disapproval of the concept in some instances than is the case for other presidents. Among the private institution presidents, a larger proportion of those in states without formal coordination and of those in coordinating board states express those reservations than do other presidents.

A preponderant majority of the presidents are reasonably satisfied both with the state plans for each of the four state-coordinated programs and with their administration by the state agencies and institutions. The percentage of private institution presidents expressing reasonable satisfaction is consistently slightly higher than for the public presidents.

Both the public and the private presidents feel that the state plan for each of the federal programs has provided equitably for the interests of the public and private institutions. This view is expressed by a substantial majority of each group for each program. Only for the undergraduate facilities program do a significant number of the public presidents believe that the private sector is favored, and most of these presidents indicate that this was a planned result, in which they concurred, to meet the needs of the private institutions. The few private presidents who believe that the public institutions have been favored relate this result either to the criteria based on quantity rather than quality or to the administration of the community service and technical services program by public institutions.

Institutional Preferences for State Coordination or Direct Implementation of the Existing State-Coordinated Federal Programs

The presidents as a group prefer state coordination to direct implementation for each of the four state-coordinated programs; however, subgroups of the presidents based on the type of state coordination and on the nature of the institution (public or private; doctoral or non-doctoral) react somewhat differently from the majority group opinion.

About the same proportion of private and public presidents of institutions without doctoral programs favor state coordination. Among presidents of doctoral institutions, whereas a somewhat smaller majority of the public presidents also prefer state coordination, a majority of the private presidents prefer direct implementation.

Based on type of state coordination, more presidents in coordinating board states and state board of education states tend to prefer direct implementation than do presidents in the other states. And in coordinating board states whether the board or a separate agency acts as the administering agency seems to make a difference in the presidents' responses. For the facilities program, state coordination is preferred only where the program is administered by the coordinating board; but for the community services program, state coordination has considerably greater support when the program is administered by separate agencies or institutions.

Expansion of the Concept of State Coordination

Reactions to Conversion of Certain Existing Direct Programs to State-Coordinated Programs

A majority of the state agencies responsible for the administration of the undergraduate facilities program (Title I, HEFA) believe that the conversion of the graduate facilities program (Title II, HEFA) and the facilities loans program (Title III, HEFA) from their present status as programs implemented directly between a federal agency and the institutions to state-coordinated programs administered by them under state plans would be desirable from the viewpoint of state planning and coordination of higher education.

All of the governing boards and state boards of education, and sixty percent of the coordinating boards, administering the Title I program favor state coordination for the other two facilities programs, but only a small majority of the special facilities agencies believe such a change to be desirable.

Those agencies favoring state coordination emphasize that all three programs relate to facilities construction, that many projects contain both undergraduate and graduate facilities and that common administration of the three programs would permit greater flexibility in funding. The agencies that do not favor combining the administration of the programs are concerned about the different types of criteria used in each of the programs. Whereas they are prepared to administer the predominantly objective criteria of the undergraduate facilities program, they are reluctant to assume responsibility for the subjective quality judgments required by the graduate facilities program and for establishing the debtor-creditor relationship between the institutions and the Federal Government required by the loans program.

More of the general state agencies than the special facilities agencies are willing to assume this additional responsibility because they see it as consistent with their general authority for planning and coordinating higher education, whereas many of the special agencies react negatively because of their reluctance to assume the greater and different responsibilities inherent in the other two programs which probably would complicate their relationships with the graduate institutions.

Eighty percent of the governing and coordinating agencies expressing an opinion would favor state coordination for the library resources program (Title II A, HEA). The agencies view this program as one which would complement their general planning and coordinating authority and would permit joint programs of state and federal funding to bring greater comparability in library resources to the institutions for which they are generally responsible.

The institutions, as represented by the opinion of their presidents, have a different attitude toward state coordination of the graduate facilities program and the facilities loan program than do the state agencies. Although a majority of the presidents of both public and private institutions without doctoral programs favor state coordination for the graduate facilities program, a majority of the public presidents and almost ninety percent of the private presidents of institutions with doctoral programs oppose the idea of state coordination for this program. Quite obviously, the institutions which would be most directly affected by a change in the administration of the program are opposed to such a change.

Presidents opposed to state coordination give as reasons for their opposition that: (1) graduate education is regional and national in nature and should be evaluated and supported at the national level; (2) greater sophistication in evaluating graduate needs exists in Washington; (3) criteria for decisions on graduate facilities should be completely different from the purely objective criteria used in the undergraduate facilities program; (4) out-of-state judgments are needed to avoid political decisions on expansion of in-state graduate programs; (5) the limited number of graduate institutions in many states makes state administration unnecessary; and (6) the limited funds under the Title II program would be ineffectively utilized if allocated on a state basis.

Presidents of graduate institutions who favor state coordination of the graduate facilities program comment that: (1) many facilities projects combine graduate and undergraduate programs and could be better coordinated by one agency; (2) state authorities are more familiar with the needs of the institutions; (3) the present administration of Title II is of limited benefit to institutions with emerging graduate programs; (4) a state agency could exercise restraint on the smaller institutions; and (5) the extended negotiations required can more conveniently be conducted at the state level.

The presidents are sharply divided in their opinions as to the desirability of changing the facility loans program to a state-coordinated program. Although a majority of public presidents and a substantial majority of presidents of institutions without doctoral programs favor state administration, a majority of private presidents and a majority of presidents of doctoral institutions do not favor such a change. In contrast to the general pattern of opposition to state coordination among presidents of doctoral institutions, a majority of the presidents of such institutions in governing board states favor a change to state administration for this program.

Reactions to Extension of Concept of State-Coordination for Federal Programs Generally

Most state governors favor the extension of the concept of state coordination of federal aid to other programs but an appreciable number qualify their opinions by recognizing the necessity for having adequate safeguards for the interests of the private institutions.

Somewhat surprisingly, a majority of the governing and coordinating agencies are not prepared to express an opinion as to whether or not there are other federal programs which if administered as state coordinated programs would enhance state planning and coordination. Of the minority which do express a definite opinion, almost all believe that there are. The programs specifically mentioned by two or more of the agencies include the graduate facilities program, facility loans, non-sponsored research, library improvement grants, and the developing institutions program.

On the general question as to whether or not the conversion of other programs to a state coordinated basis would enhance both the reasonable interests of the institutions and state planning and coordination, forty percent of the presidents are not prepared to take a definite position, but of those who do, a substantial majority express negative opinions. A substantially larger proportion of the private presidents than the public presidents have definite opinions and the percentage of private presidents expressing a negative reaction is considerably larger than for the public presidents.

The responses of the governing and coordinating agencies that attempt to differentiate between programs which should be administered by the state and those which should be implemented directly with the institutions reveal no pattern or consensus and vary from the opinions expressed by two agencies that all programs should be state-administered to the opinion of one agency that most programs should be left with the institutions. Several agencies that attempt general statements of criteria to differentiate the two types of programs generally tend to distinguish between programs which have statewide implications or affect all institutions of higher education and those which pertain only to local academic concerns or to specific institutions. Either expressly, or by clear implication, these agencies propose a role for the state coordinating agency even for programs directly implemented with the institutions. They would require approval of institutional proposals by the state agency to assure the appropriateness of the proposals to the institutions assigned role in the general state plan or system and to provide a check on commitments of future state funding. This position reflects the primary concern of these state agencies for their relationships with the public institutions for which they have some general responsibility and a desire on their part for authority to review institutional proposals rather than to administer programs.

In the opinion of the presidents, the federal programs which should be administered directly between the federal agencies and the institutions, in order of the frequency with which they are mentioned, are: research programs, NSF-NIH type programs, departmental or institutional development programs, graduate and professional education programs, and student aid. An appreciable number of presidents take the position that all or nearly all federal programs should be implemented directly, but a few private presidents take the position that none of the federal programs should be so implemented.

Impact of Federal Programs Related to Type of State Coordination

At the time the material for this study was gathered three general types of formal state organizations were responsible for either the coordination or the governance and coordination of higher education in thirty-eight of the states. In thirteen states governing boards were responsible for the governance and coordination of all, or all senior, institutions of higher education; in twenty-one states coordinating boards or commissions were responsible in varying degrees for state planning and for the coordination of the state-supported institutions; and in four states the state boards of education had either some governing authority or some planning and coordinating responsibility for higher education. Twelve states did not have formal state organizations specifically charged with the responsibility for these functions, although in one state, Indiana, there was an established informal arrangement among the presidents of the four state colleges and universities to coordinate budget requests to the legislature.

To interpret properly the reactions of these agencies and those of the presidents and governors to the federal programs in aid of higher education, an understanding of the basic differences between the three types of state organizations is essential. The most important difference between the statewide governing boards and the coordinating boards and most of the state boards of education is that the institutions are directly responsible to and are "governed" by the governing boards, whereas the institutions, or systems of institutions, in the other two types of states have separate boards responsible for their governance, with the coordinating boards or state boards of education exercising certain overall planning or coordinating authority. The authority of the governing boards over their institutions is direct, complete and final; the authority of the coordinating boards and most of the state boards of education is a planning and integrating authority over separate and independent units.

With one exception, the governing boards have been in existence for thirty years or more. They were established in times of relative educational tranquility and their relationships with the institution and the state were fully developed prior to the era of academic turbulence which followed World War II. Most of the coordinating boards have been created during the last fifteen years to bring systematic planning and coordination development to higher education in their states. The state boards of education are not new organizations but, except for New York, their authority in the area of higher education is a recent development motivated generally by the same issues and problems which led to the creation of coordinating agencies in the states.

There is not the same comparability in authority, function and procedures among the coordinating boards and the state boards of education as there is among the governing boards. The authority of coordinating boards ranges from a merely advisory function, or a planning function, to responsibility for approval of academic programs and for budget review and recommendations. The fact that the coordinating board is interposed between the institutions and the general agencies of state government necessarily means that at least to some extent it is exercising functions or authority which were previously the responsibility of either the institutions or these general state agencies, or both. In many of the coordinating board states the role of this new agency has not been fully accepted. The attitude of many institutions has been, at best, one of reluctant acquiescence. And general state agencies, including legislatures, have been reluctant to support the board in the very areas which have been delegated to it. The coordinating board tends to be criticized by the institutions as simply another bureaucratic layer of administrative control infringing on their autonomy, and by the legislature as a pressure group for the institutions. Although some coordinating boards have been more successful than most in developing a viable relationship, the role of the coordinating board in most states is an uncertain and still developing one.

With this background, the different reactions and positions of the three types of agencies and of their governors and institutional presidents can be better understood and interpreted.

Since 1963, more changes have occurred in the organization, authority and function of the coordinating boards than in the governing boards and state boards of education, and more of the coordinating boards and the presidents in these states attribute the changes in some degree to the influence of the state-coordinated federal programs than do the other agencies and their presidents. However, in Oregon, as a direct result of the state-coordinated federal programs a coordinating agency has been superimposed over the statewide governing board. In the opinion of the agencies, the governors and the presidents, responsibility for the administration of the federal programs has had a greater impact in increasing the stature and stability of the coordinating boards than the other two types of agencies. None of the governing boards believe that their administration of these programs has improved their relationship with state government but a number of the coordinating boards do see this effect.

A greater proportion of the coordinating boards assess their administration of the federal programs as being materially helpful in carrying out their general planning and coordinating responsibilities than do the governing boards or state boards of education and only the coordinating agencies believe that the assignment of a federal program to a special agency or institution has adversely affected their general responsibilities. Moreover, two-thirds of the coordinating boards believe that in general the administration of the federal programs by other state agencies or institutions has adversely affected, at least to some extent, their planning and coordinating efforts, but only one governing board holds this opinion. Consequently, a majority of the coordinating boards would prefer to administer all of the federal programs but the governing boards would not.

From the viewpoint of the presidents, those in governing board states generally either favor or are not opposed to concentration of all federal programs in their governing boards. In the coordinating board states, a majority of the presidents would not want their coordinating board to have responsibility for all programs, and this is the opinion of most of the presidents in coordinating board states where the undergraduate facilities program is administered by a separate agency. The presidents in the state board of education states apparently concur generally with the position of the presidents in the governing board states.

Although a substantial majority of the presidents believe that there is general approval of state coordination among the institutions for the four federal programs proportionately more of the presidents in coordinating board and state board of education states than in governing board states indicate the existence of doubt and apprehension concerning state administration of these programs.

In regard to the effect of the federal programs implemented directly with the institutions, only one of seven governing boards and one of three state boards of education express the opinion that these direct programs have made more difficult their effective coordination of higher education, but a substantial majority of the coordinating agencies believe that, at least to some extent, they have had this effect. Several coordinating agencies believe that the total federal support received by certain of the institutions in their states has reached a level that makes difficult the effective coordination of these institutions in the state system, whereas none of the governing boards or state boards of education finds this to be the case.

Although the presidents in general express a preference for state coordination rather than direct implementation of each of the four state-coordinated federal programs, proportionately more of the presidents in coordinating board and state board of education states prefer direct implementation of all but the technical services program than do the presidents in governing board states. In the coordinating board states, state coordination of the undergraduate facilities program receives greater support where the coordinating board rather than a separate agency administers the program, but for the community service program state coordination has greater support where a separate agency or institution is the administering agency. Among the governing board states, however, there is a consistent pattern of support for state coordination regardless of whether the governing board or a separate agency or institution administers the programs.

In regard to expanding the concept of state coordination to other federal programs, the governing and coordinating agencies were queried specifically about three programs and were also asked for their general reaction. Of the governing and coordinating agencies that administer the undergraduate facilities program, all of the governing boards and state boards of education and a majority of the coordinating agencies favor state administration for the graduate facilities program. These governing boards and state boards of education also favor their assumption of the administration of the facilities loans program but a majority of the coordinating agencies are opposed. The state boards of education and the coordinating agencies favor converting the library resources program (Title II A, HEA) to state administration but a majority of the governing boards do not. When asked if there were other directly-implemented federal programs which if administered under state plans by the state agencies would enhance state planning and coordination, seventeen of the governing and coordinating agencies state that they are not prepared to express an opinion and three others by not replying indicate similar uncertainty. However, ten of the twelve that do give a definite answer express the opinion that there are such programs. The responses of the three types of agencies are substantially the same.

Among the institutional presidents, only in the governing board states does a majority favor state administration for the graduate facilities program. Even among the presidents of doctoral institutions in these states almost half of them favor state coordination for this program--a much higher percentage than for presidents of similar institutions in states with other types of coordination. An even larger majority of the presidents in governing board states, including a majority of the presidents of doctoral institutions, also approve of state administration for the facilities loans program. A bare majority of the presidents of institutions in states without formal coordinating organizations share this opinion but the presidents in coordinating board and state board of education states oppose such a change. In response to the general question as to whether there were other direct programs which if converted to state-coordinated programs would enhance both the interests of the institutions and state planning and coordination, a larger proportion of the presidents in governing board states than in the other states indicate that they are not prepared to answer, and for those presidents who do give definite answers half of the presidents in governing board states respond affirmatively, whereas sizeable majorities of the presidents in each of the other types of states give negative answers.

Although, as will be discussed in the section following, the nature of the institutions (i.e., public or private and doctoral or non-doctoral) has the greater influence on the opinions expressed by the presidents, the analysis in the preceding paragraph indicates that presidents in governing board states do differ from presidents in states with other types of coordination in their general reaction to an extension of the concept of state coordination of federal programs.

From this summary the following conclusions can be drawn: 1. Federal programs in aid of higher education, both the state-coordinated programs and those implemented directly between the institutions and federal agencies, have had the greatest impact on coordinating boards and the least impact on statewide governing boards.

Because of the wide differences in the responsibilities, functions and authority of the coordinating agencies, the impact on these agencies of external influences such as the federal programs, has been somewhat varied and the reactions of the agencies somewhat diverse. Moreover, because the role of the coordinating agency, and its relationships to state government and with the institutions, is still developing, there is great sensitivity to the influence of external forces which tend to strengthen or to weaken the position of the agency. Consequently, the reaction of a majority of the coordinating agencies is that the federal programs implemented directly with the institutions make effective planning and coordination by the agency more difficult; that their responsibility for one or more of the state-coordinated federal programs adds to the authority, stature and stability of the agency and tends to support such general planning and coordinating authority as they may have; that dispersal of the authority for these programs to other agencies or institutions tends to encroach upon or weaken their general authority; and that concentration of administrative responsibility for all the state-coordinated federal programs in the coordinating agency would be desirable. Furthermore, a majority of the coordinating agencies would favor state administration for the graduate facilities program to provide increased state coordination of physical plant expansion and for the library resources program (Title II A, HEA) to improve state coordination of institutional library development; but would not approve involving the state in the administration of the facilities loans program.

Because of the greater comparability of authority, function and procedures among the statewide governing boards, the impact of the federal programs on these boards and their reaction to these programs has been less diverse than is the case with the coordinating agencies. And because the role of the governing boards is well established as the governing body for its institutions, there is less concern about the effect of external influences on its authority and position The directly-implemented federal programs have not created substantial difficulties for the governing boards, and their responsibility for state-coordinated program has not affected their authority, stature or stability, or their relationship with state government. In the opinion of most of the governing boards, the responsibility for these programs has not aided materially their general planning and coordinating responsibilities; nor has the assignment of one or more of the programs to other agencies or institutions adversely affected their planning and coordinating efforts. From their position of established authority, they see no need for having all state-coordinated federal programs administered by the board. They do not favor state administration of the library resources program but those that administer the undergraduate facilities program favor their assumption of the administration of the graduate facilities and facilities loans programs.

The impact of the federal programs on the state boards of education which have some general planning and coordinating responsibilities for higher education is similar to, but is not completely consistent with, the effect on the governing boards. These agencies are similar to the governing boards in that they are well-established state organizations but, except for New York, their present general authority in higher education is comparatively recent and the nature and extent of this authority varies considerably (from coordinating responsibilities to governing authority) among the several agencies. The fact that only four states are in this group, that only three of these state boards participated in the study and that not all of the three responded to all of the questionnaire makes generalizations difficult.

The state-coordinated federal programs have had no effect on the organization or general authority of the state boards of education or on their relationship with state government; and only one board believes that its administration of some of the programs has, to a limited extent, improved its standing and acceptability. Although only one board indicates that responsibility for the administration of the federal programs has aided its planning and coordinating activities, none believes that administration of the programs by other state agencies or institutions has adversely affected its own role, and all three boards believe that these programs have supported general state planning and coordinating efforts. In regard to the direct federal programs, only one board is of the opinion that they have made more difficult the effective planning and coordination of higher education, but all three favor state administration for the library resources program and the two that administer the undergraduate facilities program favor their assumption of the administration of the graduate facilities program and the facilities loans program.

2. There is less support for state coordination among presidents in coordinating board and state board of education states than among presidents in governing board states.

Although the presidents under each of the three types of state coordination approve generally the concept of state coordination for the four federal programs and approve specifically the state plans and administration of each of these programs, proportionately more of the presidents in coordinating board and state board of education states than presidents in governing board states believe that there is general doubt and apprehension concerning state coordination; and more of the presidents in coordinating board states than in the other states are not satisfied with the state plans and administration of specific programs. Moreover, although substantial majorities of all the presidents express a preference for state coordination rather than direct implementation of each of the four programs, a larger percentage of presidents in coordinating board and state board of education states than in governing board states favor direct implementation. In regard to the conversion of programs implemented directly with the institutions to state-administered status, the presidents in governing board states favor state administration for the graduate facilities program and the facilities loans programs but such a change is opposed by the presidents in coordinating board and state board of education states; and proportionately more of the former group than of the latter two groups believe that there are other direct programs which could be converted to state-administered programs and still serve the interests of the institutions as well as enhancing state planning and coordination.

Analysis of Presidents' Opinions Regarding Federal Programs Based on Type of Institution

A major consideration in this study is the general interest of the institutions in state planning and coordination of higher education and in the federal programs which affect these state functions. As previously stated, the opinions and reactions of the institutions as expressed by their presidents are pertinent to the assessment of programs which directly or indirectly affect their educational role or institutional autonomy.

In interpreting these opinions and reactions, two general classifications are used: (1) public and private institutions, and (2) institutions offering doctoral programs and those that do not. The first is important because it provides a separate examination of the reactions of presidents of state-supported institutions governed or coordinated by state agencies and those of presidents whose institutions, except in a few states, have been traditionally independent of state control and influence. The second classification is important because it recognizes the quite considerable differences in the interests and issues germane to graduate education and those pertaining primarily to undergraduate institutions.

Prior to the enactment in 1963 of Title I, HEFA, in most of the states there was no formal involvement of private institutions with state agencies or with state plans. The public and private sectors of higher education developed separately to provide parallel systems of higher education with great diversity within and between the two systems. Within the public sector, increased state planning and coordination at the state level in recent years has attempted to bring some degree of orderly development to the state systems to meet the demands of burgeoning enrollments and the rapid expansion of knowledge; within the private sector, formal and informal arrangements and organizations within and between groups of private institutions have attempted to meet the same challenges and problems. Between the two sectors, however, there has been little effective coordination of efforts at joint planning. In some states, state agencies in their state planning have tried to recognize the present contributions of private institutions and to project their future role; and private institutions, when they have been asked, have cooperated in different degrees--often in a sense of self-protection--in projections of educational demands and in the planning to meet these demands.

With the implementation of the state-coordinated federal programs of the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the State Technical Services Act, the private institutions became involved on a formal basis with state organizations and with state planning and coordination. Representation of the private sector on state agencies and on advisory committees for these programs has afforded the private institutions some voice in the implementation of the programs and has brought them within the sphere of influence of the state. The broad planning for higher education supported by the planning grants under the Higher Education Facilities Act has encouraged and abetted state planning which includes, or should include, the private sector. This new involvement of this sector of higher education in state planning and coordination has brought about a reappraisal by the private institutions of their traditional position of separate and independent status and has caused concern on the part of many for the implications of direct involvement in the state's sphere of influence.

The creation of federal programs which insert state interests and state administration into what previously had been exclusively a direct relationship between the institutions and federal agencies has also affected the position of the public institutions. Flexibility in financing and in planning incident to separate sources of funding has been somewhat curtailed by state plans developed and implemented by state agencies.

The viewpoints and opinions of the presidents are affected not only by the status of their institutions as public or private, but also by the academic nature of the institutions. The sharpest differences in the reactions of the presidents are found between presidents of doctoral institutions and those of institutions without doctoral programs. Development of graduate programs is regarded more as a national concern than is the development of undergraduate education. The major graduate institutions, public as well as private, tend to feel a closer relationship to the national academic community and to the federal government than they do to the academic community of the state and to the state. This bias on their part is reflected in their responses to the issues and questions raised by the study.

The major differences in the reactions of the public and private institutions and in the reactions of the doctoral institutions and the predominantly undergraduate institutions are reflected in the following summary.

A majority of the presidents of public institutions expressing an opinion believe that the state-coordinated federal programs have not caused any significant changes in the organization, authority, or functions of their governing or coordinating agencies but a majority of the private presidents expressing an opinion believe that they have. The opinions of the private presidents relate to the inclusion of the private institutions under the federal programs administered by the governing and coordinating agencies.

In regard to the general reaction of the institutions to state administration rather than direct implementation of the four federal programs, a substantial majority of both the public presidents and the private presidents believe that among their respective groups of institutions there is general approval of state coordination and none believes that there is general disapproval. However, among both groups more (but not a majority) of the presidents of doctoral institutions than presidents of other institutions feel some doubt and apprehension concerning state administration of the programs or that there are one or more institutional exceptions to a general sense of approval; and these negative qualifications are proportionately greater among the private presidents than the public presidents.

A preponderant majority of both the public and private presidents are reasonably satisfied with the state plans and with the state administration of each of the four federal programs but, somewhat surprisingly, a slightly larger percentage of the private presidents than the public presidents express approval. Such negative reactions to the undergraduate facilities and equipment programs as do exist tend to come more from the graduate institutions and similar reactions to the community service and technical services programs are more from the smaller, predominantly undergraduate institutions.

A markedly different result occurs in regard to the preferences of the presidents for either state administration or direct implementation for each of the four programs. As separate groups, both the public presidents and private presidents express a preference for state coordination for each of the programs but sharp differences exist between the preferences expressed by presidents of doctoral institutions and those expressed by other presidents. Although a majority of the doctoral institution presidents in the public sector favor state administration for each of the programs, the percentage is considerably less than for the presidents of non-doctoral institutions. Among the private presidents, those representing doctoral institutions prefer direct implementation of all but the technical services program. The percentage of presidents of non-doctoral institutions favoring state administration for the facilities program and the equipment program is substantially the same for the private and public sectors but a somewhat smaller proportion of the private presidents than the public presidents of non-doctoral institutions prefer state administration of the community service and technical services programs. A comparison of the preferences of these sub-groups of presidents is more accurate than a comparison of the opinions of the public presidents and private presidents as separate groups because the composition of each of the groups is quite different. Two-thirds of the public presidents participating in the study represent doctoral institutions, whereas only one-third of the private presidents represent this type of institution.

A majority of both the public and private presidents are opposed to concentrating administrative authority for all of the state-coordinated programs in the governing or coordinating agency but there is greater opposition to such a consolidation of administrative responsibility among the presidents of doctoral institutions than among presidents of other institutions. Consequently, because proportionately there are fewer doctoral institutions in the private institution sample than in the sample of public institutions, the majority of all private presidents opposed to consolidation is less than that for all public institutions.

Both public and private presidents believe that state coordination of the four federal programs has not affected to any appreciable extent the relationship between the public and private institutions in their states. This consensus is only slightly larger for the private than for the public presidents and on this issue the academic level of the institution (doctoral or non-doctoral) does not make an appreciable difference in the opinions expressed.

In regard to the conversion of the graduate facilities program (Title II, HEFA) and the facilities loans program (Title IV, HEFA) from programs implemented directly with the institutions to state-coordinated programs administered under state plans by the state agencies responsible for the undergraduate facilities program, the presidents of the non-doctoral institutions approve but the presidents of the doctoral institutions oppose such a change. In both instances the opposition of the private presidents is greater than that of the public institution presidents. The institutions directly affected by Title II--the graduate institutions--clearly prefer to deal directly with Washington; and the private graduate institutions are especially fearful of the consequences to the graduate programs of decisions and priorities made by state agencies.

On the general issue as to whether or not there are other direct federal programs which if converted to state-administered programs would enhance both the reasonable interests of the institutions and state policy and coordination, a substantial proportion of the presidents were not prepared to express an opinion but of those who do give a definite response a majority of both the public and private presidents give a negative reply. Among the public presidents, a small majority of those representing non-doctoral institutions indicate that there are programs which could be converted but a substantial majority of the presidents of doctoral institutions take the opposite position. Among the private presidents, a substantial majority of the presidents of non-doctoral institutions and all but one of the presidents of doctoral institutions do not believe that there are direct federal programs that would continue to serve the interests of the institutions if administered by the state.

From this summary the following conclusions can be drawn: 1. The different nature of institutions with and without doctoral programs has a greater influence and effect upon the opinions and reactions of their presidents to federal programs in aid of higher education than does the different status of public and private institutions.

In general the differences between the opinions and reactions of presidents of doctoral institutions and those of presidents of non-doctoral institutions are basic and substantial; the differences between institutions of the same academic nature in the public sector and in the private sector are a matter of degree. Predominantly graduate institutions, public or private, have common interests which relate more to the national educational community than to the state level, although many of the private graduate institutions may be more completely committed to their national role than are state universities, which cannot ignore their obligations to the state. The faculties and the administrators of the major graduate institutions have more involvement and closer ties with national organizations and agencies than with state organizations and agencies and may have more influence in Washington than in their state capitol. Moreover, since the federal agencies staff their agencies from the national pool of talent, the graduate institutions feel that there is more sophistication and more understanding of issues vital to graduate education in these agencies than in the state agencies. Consequently, many of these institutions prefer to negotiate and work directly with the federal agencies rather than to deal with state agencies.

On the other hand, the less complex institutions which are not competing in national graduate circles and which may have fewer faculty and staff members personally involved with federal agency staffs tend not to give the same importance to direct negotiations with Washington as the complex, graduate institutions. They tend also to have interests more closely related to similar institutions in their state and region than do the graduate institutions. Moreover, many of the smaller institutions, private as well as public, have found that staffs of the state agencies administering the federal programs are materially helpful in the preparation and submission of requests and that carrying on continuing negotiations with the state is more convenient and more satisfactory than negotiating from a distance with federal agencies in Washington. These comments are also pertinent to the following conclusions.

2. The presidents of both public and private institutions that do not offer doctoral programs believe that there is general approval among the institutions for state coordination of the four federal programs; they are generally satisfied with the state plans and state administration of each of the programs; and they express a preference for state coordination rather than for direct implementation for each of the four programs.

3. The presidents of both public and private doctoral institutions believe that there is general approval among the institutions for state coordination of the federal programs; they are generally satisfied with the state plans and state administration of each of the programs; and the

presidents of the public institutions express a preference for state coordination rather than direct implementation for each of the four federal programs, but the presidents of the private doctoral institutions prefer direct implementation for all but the technical services program.

4. The presidents of doctoral institutions oppose changing the graduate facilities and facilities loans programs to state-administered programs but the presidents of institutions not offering doctoral programs approve such a change. A larger proportion of the private presidents than the public presidents in each group oppose the change.

5. The presidents of doctoral institutions, public and private, and the presidents of private non-doctoral institutions do not believe that there are other federal programs which if changed to a state-administered basis would enhance both the interests of their institutions and state planning and coordination. Only presidents of public non-doctoral institutions hold this opinion.

Development of Guidelines for Determination of the Method of Implementation for Federal Programs in Higher Education

The Viewpoint of State Governing and Coordinating Agencies

To ascertain whether general guidelines might be developed for determining the types of federal programs which should be implemented solely and directly with the individual institutions and those which should be administered by state agencies under state plans, the statewide governing and coordinating agencies were asked to give their opinions as to the types of programs appropriate for each method of implementation. The fact that ten of the participating governing and coordinating agencies did not respond and that the replies of those that did range from the position that all federal programs should be administered by state agencies to the opinion that most programs should be implemented directly indicates the absence of any consensus among the agencies as to any general policy or criteria for determining the method of implementation. The only type of program specifically mentioned with any consistency by a number of the agencies as one which should be directly implemented with the institutions is research support.

Among the several agencies that attempt statements of general policy for determining the method of implementation, two factors emerge: (1) that the determination should be based on whether the program applies to all, or most, institutions, requiring identification of needs and determination of institutional priorities, or whether it applies only to specific institutions or to local or disciplinary academic matters of concern only to faculties or faculty members; and (2) that the primary concern is to have the approval of institutional participation in most federal programs rather than general administrative responsibility for the programs. If a program has statewide implications or application, these agencies would consider it desirable for the state agency to have the administrative authority to determine state needs and institutional priorities and in most programs they would want the authority to determine that institutional participation was in accord with the established or assigned mission or role of the institution.

This latter position indicates a greater concern by these agencies for limiting the public institutions to their assigned role in the state system of higher education and for having some control over institutional commitments of future state funding than for having general administrative responsibility of federal programs which include the private institutions. Although this is a control that many of the public institutions, especially the major graduate institutions, would find objectionable, it is an issue that can be worked out on the state level. To the extent that such authority is given to the state agencies, there should be less demand for state administration of federal programs.

The Viewpoint of the Presidents

The presidents were asked to give examples of the types of federal programs that should be implemented solely and directly with the individual institutions. Fifteen percent of those responding state that all federal programs should be administered directly and an additional five percent say that "nearly all" such programs should be implemented in this manner. Most of these responses are from presidents of doctoral institutions and are from states with coordinating boards. A few presidents of private, non-doctoral institutions, all but one of whom are in states with coordinating boards, express the opinion that none of the federal programs should be implemented directly with the institutions.

Forty percent of the presidents specifically mention programs in support of research as a type of program which should be implemented directly. Programs in support of graduate and professional education and NSF-NIH type programs, which are closely related to research, are also given as examples by significant numbers of the presidents. The only other programs mentioned with significant frequency are departmental or institutional development programs and student-aid programs. As would be anticipated, most of the presidents giving as examples research programs, NSF-NIH type programs and graduate or professional education programs represent doctoral institutions.

Two private institution presidents give significant general policy statements. One believes that state plans are adaptable to undergraduate work but that programs for research and graduate training and those that are significant to the development of human resources and research on a national level should be awarded on an institutional basis by the federal agencies. The other takes the position that, in general, all federal programs involving higher education, graduate or undergraduate, should be implemented directly, except for programs (such as the undergraduate facilities program) where the national need is broad enough that formula allocation by state is appropriate, where there are objective criteria which will assure the fulfullment of the national purpose and treat public and private institutions equitably, and where the federal funds are additive and are not so small that an allocation by states would result in an ineffective dissipation of these resources.

These two statements of policy either are in agreement or complement each other except in the area of federal support for undergraduate programs. Other than in this area, the combined statements provide a policy basis for determining the method of implementation for federal programs with which most of the presidents could reasonably be expected to concur.

Conclusions

For the reason that there are basic differences between the roles, authority and status of the three types of governing and coordinating agencies and considerable variations in these factors among the coordinating agencies and among the state boards of education, the absence of any general consensus as to appropriate guidelines or criteria for determining the method of implementation of federal programs is to be expected. There is, however, one basic concern underlying the opinions of some of the state agencies which is either specifically stated or is discernable from their responses in various areas of the study; i.e., that they have the authority to determine for the public institutions for which they have some responsibility the appropriateness of institutional participation in federal programs to the established or assigned role and scope of the institutions and some check on the future commitment of state funds. This is a concern that does not, or should not, extend to the participation of private institutions in federal programs.

To the extent that the state agencies administer federal programs in which there can be application of criteria based on state need and involving some state determination of priorities, the authority desired by the agencies does exist. But many of the agencies want this authority also to control public institution participation in directly implemented federal programs. This is a state issue which should be determined by the individual states and it should not be a factor in determining federal policy regarding aid to higher education. If, and to the extent that, state control of the participation of public institutions in federal programs is necessary and desirable, this can be achieved by state procedures without providing for state administration of federal programs and thereby involving, unnecessarily, the private institutions. This position is not one of advocacy for such state control but, rather, that the question of state control is a matter for individual state negotiation and determination and should not be considered by Congress in determining whether a particular federal program should be implemented directly or through state agencies.

In this regard, it should be recalled that half of the governors, all but one of the statewide governing boards and two of the three state boards of education with coordinating responsibilities do not believe that the direct federal programs have made more difficult the effective coordination of higher education. Only among the coordinating agencies does this opinion prevail, and many of these agencies assess the difficulties caused by the direct federal programs as minor.

The following statements represent policies which would have the general support of the presidents and some degree of acceptance among the state agencies:

1. Categorical federal programs intended to meet regional and national needs or to serve or support national interests should be implemented directly with the institutions which meet the qualifications and requirements of the programs.

Although there probably would be general acceptance of this statement in principle, decisions as to what specific programs would come within this concept would be subject to dispute. Most presidents, especially presidents of major universities, would consider, quite appropriately, programs in support of research and graduate education (facilities and programs) to be covered by this concept. There would also be general agreement that support of most professional education, especially the health professions, would be included.

2. Categorical federal programs designed to involve the academic resources of the institutions in assisting the state with local and state problems should be administered by state agencies or institutions under state plans.

The State Technical Service Program is an example of the type of program which would clearly be of this nature and the Community Services and Continuing Education Program also could be included.

3. Categorical federal programs intended to meet a national need broad enough that formula allocation by state is appropriate, where there are primarily objective criteria which will assure the enhancement of the national purpose and treat public and private institutions equitably, and where the federal funds will not merely replace state funds and are not so small that allocation by state would result in an ineffective dissipation of these resources could appropriately be administered

by the state under state plans, subject to federal guidelines and criteria which encompass the above listed factors.

The undergraduate facilities program is an example of this type of program. The undergraduate equipment program can be questioned as a state-administered program on the basis of the total amount of federal support provided. If the federal appropriation for the library resources program were sufficiently large to provide state allocations of a size that would permit meaningful institutional awards, this program might well be administered by the states to meet state priorities of need.

4. Categorical federal programs not clearly within either of the two preceding concepts should be administered by federal agencies directly with the institutions.

In effect this statement recognizes a presumption favoring direct implementation of federal programs unless their purpose and structure clearly meets the criteria stated in either of the two immediately preceding statements.

The general policy represented by these four statements would not change to any material extent present policy as represented by the types of programs presently administered by the state and those implemented directly with the institutions. A need for substantial change has not been established. The major criticisms of the direct federal programs relate to the need expressed by some governors and some state agencies for sufficient control over the state-supported institutions to assure that their participation in federal programs is germane to their assigned roles in the state system and to provide some check on future commitments of state funds. Since these are matters which can, and should, be decided by the individual states, state administration of federal programs should not be used as an external means for providing those controls in all states. The interests of the private institutions must be given full consideration. If directly implemented federal programs best serve these interests, the private institutions should not be brought under state administration merely to provide the states with better control of their public institutions, particularly when there are other means for providing this control in those states where such control is determined to be necessary or desirable.

Appraisal of Reactions to Proposed New Federal Programs

Of the several proposed new federal programs which state officials and agencies and presidents of public and private institutions were asked to evaluate, the general institutional grant program is most consistently favored. The consensus of all three groups strongly supports the great need for this program.

Expanded programs of federal support for institutional and state planning also have broad support but, except for the governors, not to the same extent as the general institutional grant program. These programs differ from the latter program and from the proposed tax remission program in that they are categorical-type aid programs rather than a general support program. For this reason, although these proposed planning programs have strong support, they do not have as high a priority as a program that would provide funds for general institutional development. In fact, an adequately funded general institutional grant program could meet much of the need for institutional planning aid, and an increase in the present level of federal funds provided for general state planning under the Higher Education Facilities Act could answer the needs of the states.

Although the proposed tax remission program in support of education is popular with the governors, it does not have the same support among the state agencies as the general institutional grant program and it is opposed by half of the public presidents and by a substantial majority of the private presidents. The opposition of the presidents of the private institutions is based largely upon the conviction that federal aid to higher education through tax remission to the states would subject them to state control to an extent that would materially affect their independence and autonomy. That this would be the tendency of such a program is an opinion shared by the public presidents, the governors and the state agencies. Many of the private institutions sponsored and supported by religious denominations foresee state constitutional problems in receiving aid through the states, and these concerns are shared by the other groups. The possibility that Congressional legislation might be written in such form as to provide a flow of funds to the institution directly from the federal government under institutional allotments made by the states, thereby minimizing conflicts with state constitutional provisions restricting state aid to religious institutions, does not eliminate the deep concern of the private institutions for the preservation of their institutional character and independence under a program in which they would receive substantial funds for institutional development under state plans and priorities.

Many of the public institution presidents have reservations about a program of tax remission for support of education generally rather than for support only of higher education because they would be competing with elementary and secondary education for an appropriate share of the support provided. They are also concerned with the practical difficulty of assuring that these additional funds would be used for support of higher education over and above continuing reasonable levels of state support.

Although half of the governors would favor a tax remission program in lieu of all other federal support for education, a majority of the state governing or coordinating agencies and all but a small number of the presidents are opposed to such a complete change in the nature of federal aid. Both the agencies and the institutions recognize that such a complete substitution would effectively curtail the role of the federal government in higher education by eliminating separate federal support for programs in the national interest or serving national purposes. To say that such a move would be both an educational and a national disaster is probably not an overstatement.

The problem of equalization is also raised by some from each group. If a tax remission program should provide only for a return to a state of a certain percentage of the income taxes paid from that state, the disparity among the states in total resources directed to education would be further increased, thus further widening the differences in educational quality which may exist. On the other hand, those from the most productive states and those from states that have made major state efforts in support of education fear that application of an equalization factor could work to their detriment unless it were tied to some equitable measure of state performance in support of education.

There is less support for, and more problems are involved in, a tax remission program than a general institutional grant program. Not that the latter is free of problems. Public presidents are concerned that the states might provide less state support for higher education because of the general federal grants and some private presidents are apprehensive of what such grants might do to their support from private sources; the less affluent institutions would insist on criteria based on need to assure against "the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer" and the larger, complex institutions would prescribe criteria which would recognize institutional differences and measure quality and ability to perform.

The American Council on Education and other national educational associations are attempting to derive criteria or formulas which would provide equitably for the various types of institutions under a general institutional grant program. The function of this study is to determine the interests, concerns, and reactions of those directly involved with the issues raised and not to give the personal recommendations of the author for specific criteria to be used; nevertheless, the statement of a private university president that he supports a general institutional grant program "as a supplement to existing categorical support but not as a replacement for it" is strongly endorsed as the only realistic basis on which the widely varied types of institutions can be supported equitably and national interests can be preserved and promoted. A general support program would probably permit a reduction in the number of categorical aid programs and a more stringent evaluation of new programs but there should be no consideration given to a reduction of the major efforts in support of research and graduate education, and of some areas of professional education. As a generalization, it would seem that a formula with factors based on enrollment at different academic levels (lower division, upper division, graduate and graduate professional, and doctoral) and other factors based on productivity at different academic levels (certificates, bachelor degrees, master's and graduate professional degrees, and doctoral degrees granted) would provide general basic support related to need as represented by enrollment, to productivity as represented by degrees granted and to institutional differences as represented by different academic levels and degrees. The difficulty, of course, is in determining an appropriate and equitable relationship between the different factors.

Not included among these suggested factors is any measure of quality. Need productivity can be measured generally by objective criteria but quality is basically a matter of subjective judgment. If the general institutional grant program is to be a basic support program, would it not be well to exclude quality as a factor in determining institutional grants? To include it as a criterion in determining the level of funding for institutions would tend to further increase such differences in institutional quality as may exist. The quality of an institution, its faculty, or its programs should continue to be a factor in appropriate categorical federal programs supporting research and graduate or professional education essential to the national interest.

Although there is consistent and very substantial support for a general institutional grant program by governors and state agencies as well as by presidents of the academic institutions, a sharp division of opinion exists between the state group and the academic group regarding the method for implementing such a program. Most of the governors and the state agencies prefer implementation through the states' governing or coordinating agencies under approved state plans. Substantial majorities of the public and private institutions prefer direct implementation between the institutions and a federal agency. This difference of opinion as to the method for implementation actually reveals a basic dichotomy in conceptualization of the program. Most institutional presidents regard it as a program of grants to institutions for general development. The governors and state agencies regard it as a program to allocate funds to the states to be used for general institutional development under state plans developed in accordance with broad Congressional and agency guidelines and procedures.

If the program is developed as conceived by the presidents and objective criteria as suggested above are used, there is little need for involvement of state agencies, except perhaps to verify and audit the institutional statistics which might be the basis for fund distributions. Since state agencies in many states are already collecting these types of data, the states could be delegated the responsibility for collecting, verifying, and auditing the institutional data upon which the grants would be based, with the state administering agencies receiving federal funds to cover the cost of these services. Participation by the state in this manner should not be objectionable to the private institutions but it should provide the state with information concerning the private institutions that it may not now be getting and which should prove helpful to general state planning. Conversely, if the program is developed as conceived by governors and state agencies, the latter would have a direct and important role in developing the state plan and determining the priorities for distribution of funds to the institutions under that plan.

In the view of most of the private institutions such a state-administered program would be a substantial infringement on their autonomy and would subject them to an unacceptable degree of state influence. From the viewpoint of the public institutions, a state-administered program would materially reduce the institutional flexibility inherent in different funding sources and would subject them to closer control by the state agencies. Many state officials, however, view state participation in the program as essential to state planning and coordination of higher education and believe that the total exclusion of the state from the program would have a substantial adverse effect on the state's role in higher education.

Regardless of what method of implementation that Congress might choose, one essential requirement, which is specifically mentioned by many of the presidents, is an appropriate maintenance of effort provision to assure that the states would not reduce their support because of the grants. Consideration should be given to the applicability of such a provision to the private institutions. The existence of a provision of this nature might give these institutions a basis for obtaining the continued support from private sources which some are fearful of losing under a general federal support program.

The criteria to be used in determining general institutional development grants and the method for implementing the program (i.e., directly with the institutions or through the states) are interrelated problems. Their solution must be of such a nature as to preserve and to enhance the regional and national character of our major institutions, public and private, to guard against excessive state or federal control of institutional operations, and to preserve and to protect the independence of the private sector of higher education. These results are essential to our total educational system and to this nation. That there is great need for federal assistance in the form of general institutional support is clearly the opinion of most of those who participated in this study, but to serve appropriately the interests of the institutions as well as federal and state interests, the criteria and administrative procedures for the program must be carefully structured to provide a balance that will enhance the basic strengths of American higher education by preserving healthy educational diversity and essential institutional independence and autonomy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babbidge, Homer D., Jr., and Rosenzweig, Robert M. *The Federal Interest in Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Brumbaugh, A. J. "The Proper Relationships Between State Governments and State-Supported Higher Institutions," *Education Record*, XLII (July 1961), 173-178.

Brumbaugh, A. J., and Sugg, R. S., Jr. "Recent Developments in State and Regional Planning of Higher Education," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCCI (September 1955), 32-40.

Brumbaugh, A. J. *State-Wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

Byrne, Charles D. *Coordinated Control of Higher Education in Oregon*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1940.

Caldwell, J. T. "Organizing State-Supported Higher Education," *State Government*, XXVI (November 1953), 256-260.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Study of the Federal Government and Higher Education*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation, 1962.

Chambers, M. M. *Choice and Chance in Higher Education*. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1962.

________. *Freedom and Repression in Higher Education*. Bloomington, Indiana: The Bloomcraft Press, Inc., 1965.

________. *Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1961.

Dobbins, Charles G. (ed.). *Higher Education and the Federal Government*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1963.

Glenny, Lyman A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

________. "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," *Campus and Capitol: Higher Education and the State*. Ed. W. John Minter. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

________. "State Systems and Plans for Higher Education," *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education*. Ed. Logan Wilson. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

Harrington, Fred Harvey. "The Federal Government and the Future of Higher Education," *Educational Record*, XLIV (April 1963), 155-160.

Henderson, Algo. "The Role of the State in Higher Education," *Educational Record*, XXXII (Spring 1951), 64-69.

________. "State Planning and Coordination of Public and Private Higher Education," *Educational Record*, XLVII (Fall 1966), 503-509.

Knight, Douglas M. (ed.). *The Federal Government and Higher Education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Knorr, Owen A. (ed.). *Long-Range Planning in Higher Education*. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

Lins, L. J. *Administration of Certain Higher Education Acts in Selected States*. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education, 1968.

Little, Kenneth J. "Higher Education and the Federal Government," *Higher Education*, XX (October 1963), 3-6.

McConnell, T. R. *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

Miller, James L., Jr. "The Two Dimensions of State-Wide Higher Education Coordination," *Educational Record*, XLIII (April 1962), 163-167.

________. "Coordination of Higher Education," *AGB Reports*, IX, Washington: Association of Governing Boards, 1966, 3-12.

Millet, John D. "State Planning for Higher Education," *Educational Record*, XLVI (Summer 1965), 223-230.

Moos, Malcolm and Rourke, Francis E. *The Campus and the State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1959.

Morse, John F. "The Federal Government and Higher Education: General and Specific Concerns in the Years Ahead," *Educational Record*, XLVII (Fall 1966), 429-438.

Orlans, Harold. *The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education: A Study of 36 Universities and Colleges*. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1962.

Pliner, Emogene. *Coordination and Planning*. (Louisiana Higher Education: 3) Baton Rouge: Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc., 1966.

Quattlebaum, Charles A. "Federal Policies and Practices in Higher Education," *The Federal Government and Higher Education*. Ed. Douglas M. Knight. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Wilson, Logan (ed.). *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

Appendix

Statewide Governing and Coordinating Agencies Participating in Study

A. Governing Boards

Arizona	Arizona Board of Regents
Florida	Florida Board of Regents
Georgia	Board of Regents, University System of Georgia
Idaho	State Board of Education & Board of Regents of the University of Idaho
Iowa	State Board of Regents
Kansas	Board of Regents
Mississippi	Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning
Montana	Board of Regents, Montana University System
Rhode Island	Board of Trustees of State Colleges of Rhode Island

B. Coordinating Agencies

Arkansas	Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance
California	Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Colorado	Colorado Commission on Higher Education
Connecticut	Commission for Higher Education
Illinois	Illinois Board of Higher Education
Kentucky	Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education
Maryland	Advisory Council for Higher Education
Massachusetts	Board of Higher Education
Missouri	Missouri Commission on Higher Education
New Hampshire	Coordinating Board of Advanced Education and Accreditation
New Mexico	Board of Educational Finance
North Carolina	North Carolina Board for Higher Education
Ohio	Ohio Board of Regents
Oklahoma	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Oregon	The Educational Coordinating Council
South Carolina	Commission on Higher Education
Texas	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Utah	Coordinating Council of Higher Education
Virginia	State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Wisconsin	Coordinating Committee for Higher Education

C. State Boards of Education

Michigan	State Board of Education, State Department of Education
New York	Board of Regents, The University of the State of New York
Pennsylvania	State Board of Education

State Governors Participating in Survey

Alabama	Governor Lurleen B. Wallace
Arizona	Governor Jack Williams
Arkansas	Governor Winthrop Rockefeller
Connecticut	Governor John Dempsey
Florida	Governor Claude R. Kirk, Jr.
Hawaii	Governor John A. Burns
Idaho	Governor Don Samuelson
Illinois	Governor Otto Kerner
Iowa	Governor Harold E. Hughes
Kansas	Governor Robert Docking
Maine	Governor Kenneth M. Curtis
Maryland	Governor Spior T. Agnew
Massachusetts	Governor John A. Volpe
Michigan	Governor George Romney
Mississippi	Governor Paul B. Johnson
Missouri	Governor Warren E. Hearnes
Nevada	Governor Paul Laxalt
New Hampshire	Governor John W. King
New Mexico	Governor David F. Cargo
New York	Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller
North Carolina	Governor Dan R. Moore
North Dakota	Governor William L. Guy
Oklahoma	Governor Dewey F. Bartlett
Oregon	Governor Tom McCall
Ohio	Governor James A. Rhodes
Pennsylvania	Governor Raymond P. Shafer
South Carolina	Governor Robert E. McNair
South Dakota	Governor Nils A. Boe
Texas	Governor John B. Connally
Utah	Governor Calvin L. Rampton
Vermont	Governor Philip H. Hoff
Virginia	Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr.
Washington	Governor Daniel J. Evans
West Virginia	Governor Hulett C. Smith
Wisconsin	Governor Warren P. Knowles
Wyoming	Governor Stanley K. Hathaway

State Agencies or Institutions Responsible for the State Technical Services Act, Participating in the Study

Alabama	Alabama Community and Technical Services Agency
Alaska	Department of Economic Development and Planning
Arizona	University of Arizona
Arkansas	University of Arkansas
California	University of California-Berkeley
Colorado	Division of Commerce and Development
Connecticut	Connecticut Research Commission
Delaware	University of Delaware
Florida	Board of Regents
Hawaii	Department of Planning and Economic Development
Idaho	Department of Commerce and Development
Illinois	Department of Business and Economic Development
Iowa	Board of Regents (Iowa State University)
Kansas	Research Foundation of Kansas (Kansas State University)
Kentucky	Department of Commerce
Louisiana	Department of Commerce and Industry
Maine	University of Maine
Maryland	University of Maryland
Minnesota	State Planning Agency
Missouri	Division of Commerce and Industrial Development
Montana	University of Montana
Nevada	University of Nevada
North Carolina	State Department of Administration
North Dakota	North Dakota State Planning Agency
Ohio	Ohio Board of Regents
Oregon	Division of Planning and Development
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State University
South Carolina	State Development Board
Tennessee	University of Tennessee
Texas	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Utah	University of Utah
Virginia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute

State Agencies or Institutions Responsible for Title I - Community Service and Continuing Education Programs, Participating in the Study

Alabama	University of Alabama
Alaska	University of Alaska
Arizona	University of Arizona Arizona State Commission for Higher Education
Arkansas	University of Arkansas
California	Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Colorado	Colorado Commission on Higher Education
Connecticut	The Commission on Aid to Higher Education
Florida	State Board of Education
Georgia	The University of Georgia
Hawaii	State Department of Budget and Finance
Illinois	Board of Higher Education
Iowa	State Board of Regents
Kansas	Higher Education Facilities Commission
Kentucky	University of Kentucky
Louisiana	Louisiana Commission on Extension and Continuing Education
Maryland	University of Maryland
Missouri	Department of Community Affairs
Montana	Montana State University
Nebraska	University of Nebraska
New Hampshire	University of New Hampshire
New Mexico	University of New Mexico
New York	Board of Regents - State Education Department
North Carolina	State Board of Higher Education
Ohio	Ohio Board of Regents
Oklahoma	University of Oklahoma
Oregon	Educational Coordinating Council
Pennsylvania	Higher Education Act, Title I Agency of the Department of Public Instruction
Rhode Island	University of Rhode Island
South Carolina	University of South Carolina
South Dakota	Commission on Higher Education Facilities
Tennessee	University of Tennessee
Texas	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Virginia	University of Virginia
Washington	Planning & Community Affairs Agency
West Virginia	West Virginia University
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin
Wyoming	University of Wyoming

State Agencies Responsible for Title I - Higher Education Facilities Act and Title VI A - Higher Education Act, Participating in the Study

Alabama	State Board of Education
Alaska	Alaska Higher Education Facilities Commission
Arizona	Arizona State Commission for Higher Education
Arkansas	Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance
California	Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Colorado	Colorado Commission on Higher Education
Connecticut	Commission on Aid to Higher Education
Delaware	Higher Educational Aid Advisory Commission
Florida	State Commission for the Higher Education Facilities Act State Department of Education
Georgia	Higher Education Facilities Commission
Idaho	State Commission for Higher Education
Illinois	Board of Higher Education
Indiana	Indiana Advisory Commission on Academic Facilities
Iowa	Higher Education Facilities Commission
Kansas	Higher Education Facilities Commission
Kentucky	Commission on Higher Education
Louisiana	State Commission for the Higher Education Facilities Act
Maine	State Commission for the Higher Education Facilities Act State Board of Education
Maryland	Board of Public Works
Massachusetts	Higher Education Facilities Commission
Michigan	Higher Education Facilities Commission Bureau of Higher Education State Department of Higher Education
Mississippi	State Building Commission
Missouri	Commission on Higher Education
Montana	Commission on Higher Education Facilities Act
Nebraska	Higher Education Facilities Commission
Nevada	Nevada State Commission Board of Regents
New Hampshire	Higher Education Facilities Commission
New Jersey	State Commission for the Higher Education Facilities Act
New Mexico	Board of Educational Finance
New York	Higher Education Facilities Planning Office of Planning in Higher Education New York State Education Department Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York
North Carolina	Commission on Higher Education Facilities

North Dakota	North Dakota Higher Education Facilities Commission
Ohio	Ohio Board of Regents
Oklahoma	State Regents for Higher Education
Oregon	The Educational Coordinating Council
Pennsylvania	State Commission on Academic Facilities
Rhode Island	Commission for Higher Education Facilities
South Dakota	Commission on Higher Education Facilities
Tennessee	Higher Education Facilities Commission
Texas	Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Utah	State Building Board
Vermont	Commission on Higher Education Facilities
Virginia	Commission on Higher Education Facilities
Washington	Higher Education Facilities Commission
West Virginia	Commission on Higher Education
Wisconsin	Higher Educational Aids Board
Wyoming	Higher Education Facilities Commission State Board of Education

College and University Presidents (or Their Designees) Participating in Study

Alabama

Alabama State College, President Levi Watkins
Auburn University, President Harry M. Philpott
Jacksonville State University, President Houston Cole
Samford University, President Leslie S. Wright
University of Alabama, President Frank A. Rose

Alaska

Alaska Methodist University, President Frederick P. McGinnis
University of Alaska, President William R. Wood

Arizona

Arizona State University, President G. Homer Durham
University of Arizona, President Richard A. Harvill

Arkansas

Little Rock University, President Carey V. Stabler
Ouachita Baptist University, President Marvin Green (Acting Pres.)
University of Arkansas, President David W. Mullins

California

California State College System, Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke
Claremont Men's College, President George C. S. Benson
Pomona College, President E. Wilson Lyon
San Jose State College, President Robert D. Clark
University of California, Vice President Charles J. Hitch
University of California-Berkeley, Executive Vice-Chancellor Earl Cheit
University of California-Santa Cruz, Chancellor Dean E. McHenry

Colorado

University of Colorado, President Joseph R. Smiley
University of Denver, Chancellor Maurice B. Mitchell

Connecticut

Central Connecticut State College, President Herbert D. Welte
University of Connecticut, President Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.

Delaware

Delaware State College, President Luna I. Mishoe

Florida

Florida State University, President John E. Champion
Miami University, Vice President Armin Gropp

Georgia

Emory University, President Sanford S. Atwood
Georgia Institute of Technology, President E. D. Harrison
Georgia State College, President Noah Langdale, Jr.
University of Georgia, President Fred C. Davidson

Idaho

The College of Idaho, President Warren B. Knox
Idaho State University, President W. E. Davis
University of Idaho, President Ernest W. Hartung

Illinois

Eastern Illinois University, President Quincy Doudra
Knox College, President Sharvy G. Umbeck
Loyola University, President--Very Reverend James F. Maguire, S.J.
Millikin University, President Paul L. McKay
University of Illinois, President David Henry

Indiana

Indiana State University-Terre Haute, President Alan C. Rankin
Indiana University, President Elvis J. Stahr
Purdue University, President Frederick L. Hovde
University of Notre Dame, President Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.

Iowa

Drake University, President Paul F. Sharp
Grinnell College, President Glenn Leggett
Iowa State University, President Robert W. Parks
The University of Iowa, President Howard R. Bowen
University of Northern Iowa, President J. W. Maucker

Kansas

The College of Emporia, President Joseph R. Laughlin

Kansas (Continued)

Kansas State College of Pittsburg, President George F. Budd
University of Kansas, Chancellor W. Clarke Wescoe

Kentucky

Eastern Kentucky University, President Robert R. Martin
University of Kentucky, President John W. Oswald
University of Louisville, President Phillip Davidson

Louisiana

Louisiana State University, President John A. Hunter
Loyola University, President--Very Reverend Homer R. Holley
Tulane University, Vice President Clarence Scheps
University of Southwestern Louisiana, Vice President Ray P. Authement

Maine

Bates College, President Thomas Hedley Reynolds
Bowdoin College, President W. A. Hokanson, Jr.
University of Maine, President Edwin Young

Maryland

Johns Hopkins University, President Milton S. Eisenhower
Loyola College, President--Father Joseph A. Sellinger
Maryland State College System, Comer Coppie, Exec. Director of Trustees, Maryland State Colleges
University of Maryland, President Wilson H. Elkins

Massachusetts

Amherst College, President Calvin H. Plimpton
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, President Howard W. Johnson
Northeastern College, President Asa S. Knowles

Michigan

Michigan State University, Vice President Milton E. Muelder
University of Michigan, President Harlan Hatcher
Wayne State University, President William R. Keast
Western Michigan University, President James W. Miller

Minnesota

Carleton College, President John W. Nason

Minnesota (Continued)

Moorehead State College, President John J. Meumaier
St. Olaf College, President Sidney A. Rand

Mississippi

Jackson State College, President John A. Peoples, Jr.
Mississippi State University, President William L. Giles
The University of Mississippi, President J. D. Williams

Missouri

Saint Louis University, President--Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S. J.
Southwest Missouri State College, President Arthur L. Mallory
University of Missouri, President John C. Weaver

Nebraska

Kearney State College, President Milton J. Hassel
University of Omaha, President Kirk Naylor

Nevada

University of Nevada, Acting President Neil D. Humphrey

New Hampshire

St. Anselm's College, President--Very Reverend Placidus H. Riley, O.S.B.

New Jersey

Glassboro State College, President Thomas E. Robinson
Seton Hall University, President--Most Reverend John J. Dougherty

New Mexico

Eastern New Mexico University, President Charles W. Meister
New Mexico State University, President R. B. Corbett
The University of Albuquerque, President--Sister M. Marilyn Doiron, O.S.F.
University of New Mexico, President Tom L. Popejoy

New York

Cornell University, President James A. Perkins
New York University, President James M. Hester

New York (Continued)

State University of New York, Chancellor Samuel G. Gould
State University of New York at Binghamton, Director of Institutional Research, A. J. Duncanis

North Carolina

Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina, President Lewis C. Dowdy
Duke University, Provost Robert Taylor Cole
Shaw University, President James E. Cheek
University of North Carolina, President William C. Friday
University of North Carolina at Raleigh, President John T. Caldwell

North Dakota

North Dakota State University, President H. R. Albrecht
University of North Dakota, President George W. Starcher

Ohio

Cleveland State University, President Harold L. Enarson
Ohio State University, Vice President John E. Corbally, Jr.
Ohio Wesleyan University, President Elden T. Smith

Oklahoma

Oklahoma City University, President John F. Olson
University of Oklahoma, President George L. Cross

Oregon

Lewis and Clark College, President John R. Howard
Oregon State College of Education, President Leonard W. Rice
Oregon State System of Higher Education, Chancellor Roy E. Lieuallen
Oregon State University, President James H. Jensen
University of Oregon, President Arthur S. Flemming

Pennsylvania

Bucknell University, President Charles H. Watts, II
Drexel Institute of Technology, President William Walsh Hagerty
The Pennsylvania State University, President Eric A. Walker
University of Pennsylvania, President Gaylord P. Harnwell

Rhode Island

Rhode Island College, President Charles B. Willard
University of Rhode Island, President (Acting) F. Don James

South Carolina

Clemson University, President Robert C. Edwards
Furman University, President Gordon W. Blackwell
University of South Carolina, President Thomas F. Jones

South Dakota

South Dakota State University, President H. M. Briggs
Sioux Falls College, President Rueben P. Jeschke

Tennessee

University of Chattanooga, President William H. Masterson
University of Tennessee, President A. D. Holt
Vanderbilt University, Chancellor Alexander Heard

Texas

Rice University, President Kenneth Pitzer
Southern Methodist University, President Willis M. Tate
University of Houston, President Phillip Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin, President Norman Hackerman

Utah

University of Utah, President James C. Fletcher
Utah State University, President Daryl Chase
Weber State College, President William P. Miller

Vermont

St. Michael's College, President--Very Reverend Gerald E. Dupong, S.S.E.

Virginia

College of William and Mary, President Davis Y. Paschall
Radford College, President Charles K. Martin, Jr.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, President T. Marshall Hahn, Jr.

Washington

East Washington State College, President Emerson C. Shuck
Seattle University, President--Very Reverend John A. Fitterer, S.J.
University of Washington, President Charles E. Odegaard
Washington State University, President Glenn Terrell

West Virginia

Marshall University, President Stewart H. Smith
Morris Harvey College, President Marshall Buckalew
West Virginia University, President James G. Harlow
West Virginia Wesleyan College, President Stanley H. Martin

Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin, President F. H. Harrington

Wyoming

The University of Wyoming, President H. T. Person

A Research Project of the Southern Regional Education Board

A Study of the Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

Questionnaire A

To Be Answered by the Governing or Coordinating Body in States Having Statutory or Voluntary Coordinating Boards or Agencies

---

State ....

Name of Coordinating Agency ....

....

Name, position, and address of person completing questionnaire ....

....

1. a. Check the classification which best describes the type of coordinating board or agency in your state.

- **(1) Voluntary coordinating body** ....
- **(2) Consolidated governing board** ....
- **(3) Coordinating board, commission or agency** ....
- **(4) State Board of Education responsibility** ....
- **(5) Other** ....

....

b. Is this body responsible for governing or coordinating all post-high school, state-supported institutions of higher education? Yes .... No ....

c. If your answer to "b" is "no," what institutions are excluded from its responsibility?

....

....

d. Does its responsibility for planning and coordination encompass in any general sense non-state-supported institutions? Yes .... No ....

e. If non-state-supported institutions are included with the broad scope of the coordinating body's responsibility, explain to what extent. ....

....

....

....

2. Year in which present coordinating board or agency was created ....

3. Have there been any significant changes in the composition, organization, authority, powers, purpose or function of the present coordinating board or agency since 1962, or since its creation if later than 1962?

Yes .... No .... If your answer is "yes," please state briefly the significant changes which have occurred. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

....

4. Which of the following state-coordinated Federal programs in aid of higher education are administered by the state coordinating agency named at the beginning of this questionnaire? Check where applicable.

a. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963—Title I—Undergraduate Facilities ....

b. Higher Education Act of 1965—Title I—Community Services, etc. ....

c. Higher Education Act of 1965—Title IV B—Guaranteed Loan Program ....

d. Higher Education Act of 1965—Title VI A—Undergraduate Equipment ....

e. State Technical Service Act of 1965 ....

f. Other ....

....

....

5. If changes were listed in Question 3, were any of them attributable, directly or indirectly, to any appreciable extent to one or more of the Federal programs listed in Question 4?

Yes .... No .... If your answer is "yes," please give the basis for your answer. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

6. Has the responsibility for the administration of any of the state-coordinated Federal programs listed in Question 4 by the state coordinating agency affected the relationship of that agency to the state government, or any department or agency thereof?

Yes .... To some extent .... No .... Coordinating agency does not have responsibility for administering such programs ....

If you checked either of the first two possible answers, please indicate the program or programs responsible, and how and to what extent this relationship has been affected. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

....

7. What has been the reaction of the public institutions of higher education in the state to this new role of the state coordinating agency?

Favorable .... Unfavorable .... Apprehensive .... Little reaction one way or other .... Coordinating agency does not have responsibility for administering any of the state-coordinated programs ....

If you checked one of the first four possible answers, please indicate briefly the basis for your answer. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

....

8. What has been the reaction of the nonpublic institutions of higher education in the state to this new role of the state coordinating agency?
Favorable .... Unfavorable .... Apprehensive .... Little reaction one way or the other ....
Coordinating agency does not have responsibiilty for administering any of the state-coordinated Federal programs ....
If you checked one of the first four possible answers, please indicate the basis for your answer. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

9. Has responsibility for the administration of any of the state-coordinated Federal programs by the state coordinating agency affected to any discernible extent the relationship between the public and nonpublic institutions of higher education in the state? Yes ....
No ....
If yes, favorably .... or unfavorably ....? Coordinating agency does not have responsibility for administering any of the state-coordinated Federal programs ....
If you answered "yes," give the basis for your opinion. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

....

10. If coordination of higher education in your state is on a voluntary basis or is achieved through a voluntary organization, have the state-coordinated Federal programs in higher education stimulated significant consideration or activity for creation of a statutory coordinating agency?
Yes .... No .... Not applicable ....
If your answer is "yes," please give the facts or circumstances indicating such consideration or action, and indicate whether any one or more of the several state-coordinated Federal programs have had greater impact than the others in this regard. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

11. What impact has the administration of state-coordinated Federal programs by the state coordinating agency had on the planning and coordinating responsibilities or activities of that agency?

Substantial { aided and abetted ....
impeded .... }

Limited { aided and abetted ....
impeded .... }

Construction planning only { aided and abetted ....
impeded .... }

None .... Coordinating agency not responsible for administering of Federal program ....
If you checked other than the last optional answer, give the basis for your answer and be as specific as possible. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

12. Has the administration of state-coordinated Federal programs by the coordinating agency had any discernible effect on the influence, standing, acceptability, or stability of that agency? Yes .... No .... To a limited extent only .... Coordinating agency not responsible for administration of Federal programs..........
Other ....

....
Please explain and be as specific as possible. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

....

13. By reason of the administrative responsibility for state-coordinated Federal programs and the Federal funds provided for such administration, the coordinating agency has added the equivalent of .... professional and .... clerical personnel to its staff. Check here .... if coordinating agency is not responsible for the administration of any of the Federal programs.

14. Have any of the state-coordinated Federal programs, whether administered by the coordinating agency or other state agencies or institutions, been effective in aiding, abetting, or encouraging state efforts directed to planning or coordination of higher education? Yes .... No ....
If your answer is "yes," please indicate the programs which have been of some significance in aiding state planning or coordination and give the basis for your assessment. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

....

15. Have any of the state-coordinated Federal programs, whether administered by the state coordinating agency or other state agencies or institutions, impeded to any material extent state efforts at master planning or coordination of higher education? Yes .... No ....
If your answer is "yes," please indicate the program or programs which have had this effect and give the basis for your assessment. (Attach additional sheet if needed)

....

....

....

....

16. In any instance, has the designation of an agency or institution other than the state coordinating agency to administer a state-coordinated Federal program had an adverse effect on the planning or coordinating responsibilities or activities of the state coordinating agency?
Yes .... To some extent .... No ....
Please comment. If you answered other than "no," indicate the Federal program having this adverse effect. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

....

....

17. If two or more of the state-coordinated Federal programs have been assigned to agencies or institutions other than the state coordinating agency, what has been the cumulative effect, if any, of this dispersion of responsibility on the planning and coordinating efforts of the state coordinating agency?

Decidedly adverse ________ Somewhat adverse ________ No appreciable effect one way or the other ________ Existence of the Federal programs with their state plans, even though administered by other agencies, has abetted the planning and coordinating of the coordinating agency ________ Other ________________

____

Not applicable because coordinating agency administers all, or all but one, of the Federal programs ________ Please give the basis for your answer: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________

____

____

____

____

18. In your state have there been any instances of Federal grants or loans to state institutions (under the Facilities Act or from NSF, NIH or other Federal agencies) for construction of facilities for degree or research programs not authorized for the particular institution by the state coordinating agency, where such approval is required by state law?
Yes ________ No ________ Question not applicable to my state ________
If you answer is "yes," please give particulars. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________

____

____

____

____

19. From the viewpoint of more effective planning and coordination of higher education in your state, should Title II A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, providing grants to improve the library resources of institutions of higher education, be administered under a state priority plan developed by a state agency as is done under Title I and Title VI A of that Act and under Title I of the Facilities Act?
Yes ________ No ________ Other ________________

____

Please indicate the basis for your answer: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________

____

____

____

20. Have the institutions of higher education in your state "periodically informed" the state coordinating agency of Federal grants received under Title II A, College Library Resources, Higher Education Act of 1965, as provided by Section 208 of that Title?
Yes ________ No ________ Other ________________

____

21. Have the several Federal programs under the Public Health Service Act providing for planning in the field of health services and personnel had an impact on the planning and coordination of higher education in your state? Yes, to a material extent ________ To some extent ________ This impact has been to (a) aid and abet ________ (b) complicate and make more difficult ________ state planning and coordination of educational institutions and educational programs. Not to any appreciable extent ________
Please comment on your answer, indicating the agencies involved, the nature and extent of any coordinated planning, and the difficulties encountered or assistance given in coordinating activities related to these health service planning programs. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________

____

____

____

22. Has the categorical or programmatic basis of most Federal grant programs providing support to qualifying institutions made more difficult the effective coordination of higher education by the state coordinating agency? Yes ________ No ________ To some extent ________
Other ________________

____

Please comment on the basis for your answer: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________

____

____

____

____

23. Specifically, have Federal grants to one of your state institutions for a graduate facility, a research program, a major item of research equipment, or a teaching or research institute constrained to any appreciable extent the choice of action by the state coordinating agency on a subsequent request by that institution for approval of a graduate academic program? Yes ________
No ________ State agency does not approve new programs ________
If your answer is "yes," please comment and give a specific example. (Attach additional sheet if needed)

____

____

____

24. Are there other institution-oriented Federal programs in higher education which if administered under a state plan developed by an appropriate state agency similar to the administration of the undergraduate facilities program under the Facilities Act of 1963 or the community services program (Title I) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would enhance state planning and coordination of higher education in your state? Yes ________ No ________ Not prepared to say ________ Other

____

____

If your answer is "yes," please list the program or programs you have in mind and give your reasons for listing each such program or type of program. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________

____

____

____

25. Please suggest the types of Federal programs which appropriately should be administered under a state plan by a state agency and the types of Federal programs which appropriately should be implemented solely and directly with institutions of higher education. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________

____

____

____

____

26. Has the amount of Federal support from all sources received by any institution in your state reached a level which makes it difficult to coordinate effectively the activities of that institution as part of the state system of higher education? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______

____

If you answered "yes," please detail the difficulty encountered and indicate the percentage of Federal funds to the total budget of the institution.

____

____

____

27. The American Council on Education and other national educational organizations have recently suggested the need for a new Federal program of support available to all institutions for general institutional development. Such a basic support program could be initiated and implemented directly with the institutions of higher education on the basis of criteria provided in the Congressional Act or developed by the Federal agency administering the program; or such a program could be implemented through the several states under approved state plans developed by designated state agencies which recommend institutional priorities based on prescribed criteria.

a. Do you support the need for such Federal grants for general institutional development?
Yes ______ No ______

b. If such a grant program were to be approved by Congress, would you prefer the program to be implemented directly with the individual institutions ______ or through the state coordinating agencies under approved state plans? ______ Other ______

____

Please comment on your answers: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______________________________

____

____

____

28. Currently there are proposals before Congress to provide Federal grants to the states for comprehensive state educational planning.

a. Does your state now have a comprehensive master plan for higher education? Yes ______ No ______

b. If not, is your state now developing a comprehensive master plan for higher education? Yes ______ No ______

c. Does the existing or developing state master plan include private as well as public institutions of higher education? Yes ______ No ______ Not applicable ______

d. Are Federal funds needed to inaugurate, complete, or supplement your state master plan for higher education? Yes ______ No ______ My state does not have and does not plan to develop such a master plan in the near future ______

e. Without regard to a "master plan" as such, are Federal funds needed for instituting, completing, or supplementing general educational planning activities in higher education? Yes ______ No ______

f. Do you consider Federal support for comprehensive planning for higher education in each state a desirable and appropriate Federal assistance program? Yes ______ No ______

g. If Federal planning funds are made available, should they be provided both to the state for overall planning and to the public and private institutions for institutional planning? Yes ______ No ______ Only to the state ______ Only to the individual institutions ______

Comments, if any, on above answers: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______________________________

____

____

29. A number of Governors, and some members of Congress, have advocated a program of tax remission from the Federal government to the states. One suggestion is that such a tax remission program be dedicated to the support of all levels of education in the several states.

a. Do you, in general, favor such a program of tax remission to support the educational activities of the state? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______

____

b. Would you favor such a program if it were in lieu of all other types of Federal grants to education? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______

____

c. If your answer to "b" was "no," and if such a program of tax remission for support of education were to be approved, list the types of Federal programs which should continue to be separately supported by Congress.

____

____

____

____

____

d. Would a tax remission program in support of education in the several states encourage and abet state planning and coordinating activities in the field of higher education? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______

____

____

e. Would such a tax remission program for educational purposes materially affect the autonomy of nonpublic institutions in the several states? Yes ______ No ______ This would be the tendency, but an appropriate, carefully drawn state plan would minimize such effect ______ Other ______

____

f. Does your State Constitution pose serious problems to the inclusion of private institutions, especially church-related colleges and universities, under a plan of state support based on a tax remission program by the Federal Government? Yes ______ No ______ I do not know ______ Other ______

____

Comments: ______________________________

____

____

____

A Research Project of the Southern Regional Education Board

A Study of the Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

Questionnaire B

To the Governors of the States

The following questions relate either to institution-oriented Federal programs (programs negotiated and implemented directly with an institution by a Federal agency) or to state-coordinated Federal programs (programs administered under a state plan by a designated state agency) such as the following:

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963—Title I, Undergraduate Facilities
Higher Education Act of 1965—Title VIA, Undergraduate Equipment
Higher Education Act of 1965—Title I, Community Services and Continuing Education
Higher Education Act of 1965—Title IVB, Guaranteed Loan Program
State Technical Service Act of 1965

State ____________________

Governor ____________________

1. **Are you reasonably satisfied with the administration by the designated state agencies and institutions of the state-coordinated Federal programs listed above and with the state plans which have been developed for each? Yes ________ No ________ Yes, with the following exceptions:** ____________________

2. **Have you received, or are you aware of, any serious objections by private institutions of higher education in your state to these programs which require them to qualify for Federal grants under a state plan administered by a state agency rather than to negotiate directly with a Federal agency for aid? Yes ________ No ________**
   If your answer is "yes," please comment ____________________

3. **What has been the impact of these state-coordinated Federal programs on state planning and coordination of higher education in your state?**
   Check one or more of the following if appropriate:
   - **a. These programs have had no material effect ________**
   - **b. They have created ________ or contributed to ________ an environment conducive to state-wide planning and coordination ________.**
   - **c. They have influenced to some extent plans to establish a state coordinating agency ________.**
   - **d. They have influenced to some extent plans to strengthen or expand the authority of the existing coordinating agency ________**
   - **e. The administration of some or all of these programs by the state's coordinating agency has tended to give that agency greater stability or stature ________**
   - **f. Activities of the state-wide advisory committees for those programs have enhanced broad consideration of state-wide educational problems and opportunities ________**
   - **g. These programs have increased the availability and dissimination of comparable information or statistical data ________**
   - **h. Other** ____________________
   - **i. These Federal programs have enhanced state planning and coordination in the following specific instances or areas:** ____________________

   Comments: ____________________

4. **Do you favor extension of the concept of "state-coordination" of Federal aid to higher education to other programs? Yes ________ No ________ Yes, but only with adequate safeguards for the interests of private institutions ________ No, because of the problems incident to the preservation of the autonomy of p;rivate institutions, especially those which are church-related ________**

Other ______________________________
____
____

Comments: ______________________________
____
____
____

5. Do the many Federal programs in higher education which are negotiated and administered directly with the institutions cause substantial problems in state planning and coordination of higher education?

Yes ______ No ______

Other ______________________________
____
____

Comments: ______________________________
____
____
____

6. Would state planning and coordination of higher education be enhanced if all of the state-coordinated Federal programs were administered by or under the auspicies of the state's coordinating agency for higher education?

Check one or more of the following if applicable:

Yes ______ No ______ Yes, but the involvement of private institutions makes other arrangements more acceptable ______ Not applicable, state does not have a coordinating agency ______ Not applicable, coordinating agency now administers these programs ______ Other ______________________________
____
____

7. Currently there are proposals before Congress to provide Federal grants to the states for comprehensive state educational planning.

a. Are Federal funds needed for instituting, completing, or supplementing general educational planning activities in higher education in your state? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______________________________
____

b. If Federal planning funds are made available, should they be provided both to the state for overall planning and to the public and private institutions for institutional planning? Yes ______ No ______ Only to the state ______ Only to the institutions ______ Other ______________________________
____

c. Would you consider a Federal program of annual grants to institutions of higher education to provide basic support for institutional research and planning offices (the amount of the grant to be related to the size and complexity of the institution, with a fixed minimum and maximum) to be an appropriate and worthwhile expenditure of Federal funds in aid of higher education? Yes ______ No ______

Other ______________________________
____

d. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, it should be

(1) phased out over a 3 to 5 year period ______

(2) a continuing support program ______

e. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, should it be implemented directly with the institutions or should there be state allotments administered by designated state agencies (with representative advisory committees) under approved state plans establishing criteria for determining needs and priorities? Prefer state coordination ______ Prefer direct institutional grants ______ Other ______
____
____

8. The American Council on Education and other national educational organizations have recently suggested the need for a new Federal program of support available to all institutions for general institutional development. Such a basic support program could be initiated and implemented directly with the institutions of higher education on the basis of criteria provided in the Congressional Act or developed by the Federal agency administering the program; or such a program could be implemented through the several states under approved state plans developed by designated state agencies which recommend institutional priorities based on prescribed criteria.

a. Do you support the need for such Federal grants for general institutional development?

Yes ______ No ______

b. If such a grant program were to be approved by Congress, would you prefer the program to be implemented directly with the individual institutions ______ or through the state coordinating agencies under approved state plans? ______ Other ______
____
____

Please comment on your answers: (Attach additional sheet if needed). ______________________________
____
____
____

9. A number of Governors, and some members of Congress, have advocated a program of tax remission from the Federal government to the states. One suggestion is that such a tax remission program be dedicated to the support of all levels of education in the several states.

a. Do you, in general, favor such a program of tax remission to support the educational activities of the state? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______
____

b. Would you favor such a program if it were in lieu of all other types of Federal grants to education?

Yes ______ No ______ Other ______
____

c. If your answer to "b" was "no," and if such a program of tax remission for support of education were to be approved, list the types of Federal programs which should continue to be separately supported by Congress.

______

______

______

______

______

d. Would a tax remission program in support of education in the several states encourage and abet state planning and coordinating activities in the field of higher education? Yes ______ No ______ Other ___

______

______

e. Would such a tax remission program for educational purposes materially affect the autonomy of nonpublic institutions in the several states? Yes ______ No ______ This would be the tendency, but an appropriate, carefully drawn state plan would minimize such effect ______

Other ______

______

f. Does your State Constitution pose serious problems to the inclusion of private institutions, especially church-related colleges and universities, under a plan of state support based on a tax remission program by the Federal Government? Yes ______ No ______ I do not know ______ Other ______

______

Comments: ______

______

______

______

* * * *

Additional Comment:

A Research Project of the Southern Regional Education Board

A Study of the Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

Questionnaire C

To Be Answered by College and University Presidents

The following questions relate either to institution-oriented Federal programs (programs negotiated and implemented directly with an institution by a Federal agency) or to state-coordinated Federal programs (programs administered under a state plan by a designated state agency) such as the following:

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963—Title I, Undergraduate Facilities
Higher Education Act of 1965—Title VIA, Undergraduate Equipment
Higher Education Act of 1965—Title I, Community Services and Continuing Education
Higher Education Act of 1965—Title IVB, Guaranteed Loan Program
State Technical Service Act of 1965

State ....
Institution ....
President ....

1. Are you reasonably satisfied with the state plans which have been approved for the listed state-coordinated Federal programs?

	Yes	No
Title I—Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963	___	___
Title VI A—Higher Education Act of 1965	___	___
Title I—Higher Education Act of 1965	___	___
State Technical Services Act of 1965	___	___

For each "no" answer please give briefly the basis for your evaluation (attach additional sheet if needed).
....
....
....
....

2. Have the state plans for these state-coordinated Federal programs provided equitably for the interests of the private and public sectors of higher education in your state?

	Yes	Plan Favors Public Sector	Plan Favors Private Sector
Title I—Higher Education Facilities Act	___	______	______
Title VI A—Higher Education Act of 1965	___	______	______
Title I—Higher Education Act of 1965	___	______	______
State Technical Services Act of 1965	___	______	______

For each answer other than "yes," please give briefly the basis for your evaluations (attach additional sheet if needed). ....
....
....
....

3. Although you may be "reasonably satisfied" with the approved state plans for these state-coordinated Federal programs, are there changes in any or all of the plans which would provide substantial improvement?
Yes .... No .... Not prepared to say ....
If your answer is "yes," please give briefly the improvements which you have in mind. (Attach additional sheet if needed). ....
....
....
....

4. Are you reasonably satisfied with the administration of the state plans for these Federal programs by the designated state agencies or institutions?

	Yes	No
Title I—Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963	___	___
Title VI A—Higher Education Act of 1965	___	___
Title I—Higher Education Act of 1965	___	___
State Technical Services Act of 1965	___	___

For each "no" answer please give briefly the basis for your evaluation. (Attach additional sheet if needed).
....
....
....

5. What has been reaction of the public institutions of higher education in the state to the administration of these Federal programs by a state agency or institution under a state plan rather than direct negotiation by each institution with the Federal agency at all stages of its request? General approval .... General disapproval .... Some degree of doubt and apprehension .... Approved generally but with one or more institutional exceptions .... I don't know..........
Other ....

Give briefly the basis for your answer ....

6. What has been the reaction of the private institutions of higher education in the state to the administration of these Federal programs by a state agency or institution under a state plan rather than direct negotiation by each institution with the Federal agency at all stages of its request? General approval .... General disapproval .... Some degree of doubt and apprehension .... Approved generally but with one or more institutional exceptions .... I don't know ....
Other ....

Give briefly the basis for your answer ....

7. Has the administration of these Federal programs by a state agency under a state plan affected to any discernible extent the relationship or extent of cooperation between the public and private institutions in the state?
Yes .... No .... I do not know ....
If your answer is "yes," please be as specific as possible in describing the effect. (Attach additional sheet if needed.) ....

8. If your state has a state-wide governing board or coordinating agency which was established after 1963, was its formation attributable to any appreciable extent to the impact of the state-coordinated Federal programs? Yes .... No .... Not to my knowledge .... State governing or coordinating agency existed prior to 1964 .... State does not have a governing or coordinating agency ....
If your answer is "yes," please give the basis for this evaluation. (Attach additional sheet if needed). ....

9. If your state has a governing or coordinating board or agency which was in existence prior to 1964, have there been any significant changes since 1963 in its organization, authority, purpose, or function which could be attributed to any appreciable extent to the impact of the state-coordinated Federal programs? Yes .... No .... Not to my knowledge .... No significant changes have occurred .... State does not have a governing or coordinating agency ....
If your answer is "yes," please indicate the changes which have occurred and how these changes were influenced by these Federal programs. (Attach additional sheet if needed). ....

10. a. If your state does not now have a state governing board or coordinating agency, is there any activity to bring about the establishment of such an agency?
Yes .... No .... Only somewhat general talk by some individuals .... Not to my knowledge .... Question not applicable to my state ....
Other ....

b. If your answer is in the affirmative to any extent, is this talk or activity attributable in any appreciable degree to the impact of the state-coordinated Federal programs? Yes .... No .... Not to my knowledge ....

c. If your answer to "b" is "yes," please explain, indicating any program or programs which may have had greater impact than the others (Attach additional sheet if needed). ....

11. Other than such impact as may have been indicated in your answers to Questions 7 through 10, what general or specific effects have the state-coordinated Federal programs had on state planning or coordination of higher education in your state?
Please check one or more of the following if appropriate: None .... No material effect .... Created .... or contributed to .... an environment conducive to state-wide planning .... Activities of state-wide advisory committees for these programs have enhanced broad consideration of state-wide educational problems and opportunities .... Increased availability and dissimination of comparable information or statistical data .... Other general impact ....
If possible, please give specific examples or areas of enhanced state planning or coordination attributable to the state-coordinated Federal programs. (Attach additional sheet if needed.) ....

12. From the viewpoint solely of the best interests of your own institution, do you favor the administration of these listed Federal programs by state agencies or institutions under approved state plans, or would you prefer that these programs be implemented by the Federal agencies directly with individual institutions?

	Favor State-coordination	Prefer direct institutional implementation
Title I—Facilities Act	____	____
Title VI A—Higher Education Act of 1965	____	____
Title I—Higher Education Act of 1965	____	____
State Technical Services Act	____	____

Other ____________________

Please comment: ____________________

13. On balance, taking into consideration the Congressional purpose of each program, the interests of the state, and the common academic concerns of higher education, as well as the interests of your own institution as they relate to the other institutions in your state, are these varied interests better served by the administration of these Federal programs by state agencies under approved state plans or would these interests be equally or better served by the Federal agencies dealing directly with individual institutions?

	State-coordination better	Institutional implementation equal or better
Title I—Facilities Act	____	____
Title VI A—Higher Education Act of 1965	____	____
Title I—Higher Education Act of 1965	____	____
State Technical Services Act	____	____

Other ____________________

Please comment: ____________________

14. If Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act is being effectively and fairly administered by the designated state agency in your state, would it be desirable for Title II of the Act, providing grants for graduate facilities, to be administered under a state plan by the same agency? Yes ____ No ____ Other ____________________

Please comment: ____________________

15. Would it be desirable for Title III, Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, to be correlated with the administration of Title I to permit the state agency to administer applications for loans as well as grants, with authority to establish priorities, either identical or different, for each of the two sources of funds? Yes ____ No ____ Other ____________________

Please comment: ____________________

16. Are there other institution-oriented Federal programs in higher education (e.g., Title II, College Library Assistance, Higher Education Act of 1965) which if administered by a state agency under an approved state plan would enhance both the reasonable interests of individual institutions and state planning and coordination of higher education? Yes ____ No ____ Not prepared to say ____ Other ____________________

If your answer is "yes," please indicate the programs or types of programs which it would be reasonable to so administer. (Attach additional sheet if needed.) ____________________

17. Please give examples of the types of Federal Programs which in your opinion should be implemented solely and directly with individual institutions without the intervention of state agencies. (Attach additional sheet if needed.) ____________________

18. If in your state the several state-coordinated Federal programs are not all administered by the state's governing or coordinating board or agency, would you favor consolidating administration of all these programs in that agency? Yes ____ No ____ Makes no significant difference ____ Not applicable, all Federal programs are administered by the coordinating agency ____ Not applicable, state does not have a coordinating agency ____ Other ____________________

Comments: ____________________

19. Currently there are proposals before Congress to provide Federal grants to the states for comprehensive state educational planning.

a. Are Federal funds needed for instituting, completing, or supplementing general educational planning activities in higher education in your state?
Yes ____ No ____ Other ____________________

b. If Federal planning funds are made available, should they be provided both to the state for overall planning and to the public and private institutions for institutional planning? Yes ____ No ____ Only to the state ____ Only to the institutions ____
Other ____________________

c. Would you consider a Federal program of annual grants to institutions of higher education to provide basic support for institutional research and planning offices (the amount of the grant to be related to the size and complexity of the institution, with a fixed minimum and maximum) to be an appropriate and worthwhile expenditure of Federal funds in aid of higher education? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______

____

d. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, it should be

(1) phased out over a 3 to 5 year period ______

(2) a continuing support program ______

e. If such a Federal aid program were to be instituted by Congress, should it be implemented directly with the institutions or should there be state allotments administered by designated state agencies (with representative advisory committees) under approved state plans establishing criteria for determining needs and priorities? Prefer state coordination ______ Prefer direct institutional grants ______ Other ______

____

20. The American Council on Education and other national educational organizations have recently suggested the need for a new Federal program of support available to all institutions for general institutional development. Such a basic support program could be initiated and implemented directly with the institutions of higher education on the basis of criteria provided in the Congressional Act or developed by the Federal agency administering the program; or such a program could be implemented through the several states under approved state plans developed by designated state agencies which recommend institutional priorities based on prescribed criteria.

a. Do you support the need for such Federal grants for general institutional development?
Yes ______ No ______

b. If such a grant program were to be approved by Congress, would you prefer the program to be implemented directly with the individual institutions ______ or through the state coordinating agencies under approved state plans? ______ Other ______

____

____

Please comment on your answers: (Attach additional sheet if needed). ______________________________

____

____

____

21. A number of Governors, and some members of Congress, have advocated a program of tax remission from the Federal government to the states. One suggestion is that such a tax remission program be dedicated to the support of all levels of education in the several states.

a. Do you, in general, favor such a program of tax remission to support the educational activities of the state? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______

b. Would you favor such a program if it were in lieu of all other types of Federal grants to education? Yes ______ No ______ Other ______

____

c. If your answer to "b" was "no," and if such a program of tax remission for support of education were to be approved, list the types of Federal programs which should continue to be separately supported by Congress.

____

____

____

____

____

d. Would a tax remission program in support of education in the several states encourage and abet state planning and coordinating activities in the field of higher education? Yes ______ No ______ Other

____

____

e. Would such a tax remission program for educational purposes materially affect the autonomy of nonpublic institutions in the several states? Yes ______ No ______ This would be the tendency, but an appropriate, carefully drawn state plan would minimize such effect ______ Other ______

____

f. Does your State Constitution pose serious problems to the inclusion of private institutions, especially church-related colleges and universities, under a plan of state support based on a tax remission program by the Federal Government? Yes ______ No ______ I do not know ______ Other ______

____

Comments: ______________________________

____

____

____

* * * *

Additional Comment:

A Research Project of the Southern Regional Education Board

A Study of the Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

Questionnaire D

To be Answered by Agencies and Institutions Designated to Administer the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 Title I–Undergraduate Facilities and Higher Education Act of 1965 Title VIA–Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction Equipment

---

1. Name of State ______

2. a. Name of state agency administering Title I ______
______
   b. If different, name of state agency administering Title VI A ______
______

3. Name, title, and address of person completing report
______
______
______

4. Is this (or either of these) agency (agencies) charged with the general responsibility for governing or coordinating the state-supported institutions of higher education in the state? Yes ______ No ______ If your answer is "no," state briefly the reason for designating this agency rather than the coordinating agency to administer these Federal programs. (Attach additional sheet if needed) Check here ______ if state does not have a coordinating agency.
______
______
______
______

5. If the agency named in Question 2 is not the state coordinating agency, to what state official or agency is this agency responsible? ______
______

6. If the agency named in Question 2 is not the state coordinating agency, what is the composition of this agency? ______
______
______
______

7. If the agency named in Question 2 is not the state coordinating agency, how are the members named? ______
______
______

8. Has the state agency been provided with adequate staff to carry out its responsibilities in administering these Federal programs?
YES– Title I ______ Title VI A ______
NO– Title I ______ Title VI A ______

9. The state agency currently employs the equivalent of ______ administrative and ______ clerical full-time personnel to administer these Titles.

10. To what extent have Federal allocations for administration of these Federal programs paid the total cost of administration?
Fully– Title I ______ Title VI A ______
Federal allocations for administration have provided approximately
Title I ______
Title VI A ______
–percent of the total cost of each program

11. Has the level of Federal support for administration of these Federal programs been sufficient to permit the state agency to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it under these programs? Yes ______ No ______ Comment: ______
______
______

12. If the agency administering these Federal programs is other than the general coordinating agency (statutory or voluntary) for higher education, to what extent is there coordination between the agencies? None ______ Very little ______ Moderate ______ Extensive ______ Not applicable because state does not have a general state coordinating agency ______ Not applicable because coordinating agency administers these programs ______ If your answer indicates that some degree of coordination exists, describe briefly how this is implemented. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______
______
______
______
______

13. If these Federal programs are administered by the state coordinating agency, what impact has administration of these programs had on state-wide master planning for higher education? None ______ Interfered or detracted ______ Aided and abetted somewhat ______ Materially aided and abetted ______ Not applicable because state does not have a general coordinating agency ______ Not applicable because programs are administered by separate agency ______.
If you checked other than one of the last two options, give briefly the basis for your answer and be as specific as possible. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______
______
______
______

27. **Under the authority of Section 7, State Technical Services Act of 1965, has your state joined with another state, or other states, to establish an interstate technical services program administered by an interstate agency? Yes .... No .... If "yes," what other state or states are participating? ....**

....

If "yes," what agency or institution in your state is responsible for coordination of the state's efforts within the interstate plan?

....

....

If "yes," how were the five-year-plan and the annual program evolved? ....

....

....

If your state participates in an interstate program, how effective has it been? Quite effective .... Somewhat effective .... Not too effective ....

Comment: ....

....

....

Has there been any move to abandon the interstate program for a state program? Yes .... No ....

Other ....

Comment: ....

....

....

28. **If this program is not administered by the state coordinating agency, would it be desirable from the viewpoint of state planning and coordination of higher education for the program to be administered by that agency? Yes .... No .... State does not have a coordinating agency .... Other ....**

....

Comment: ....

....

....

....

29. **Has the establishment of this Federal program increased state attention to the problems and opportunities in the field of technical services to business and industry in the state? Yes .... No .... Other..........**

....

Comment: ....

....

....

30. **Has there been any other general or specific impact of this Federal program which should be noted?**

Yes .... No ....

If "yes," please explain ....

....

....

....

....

....

* * * *

Additional Comment:

15. If this program is administered by the state coordinating agency, what impact has administration of the program had on the planning or coordinating activities of that agency? None ________ Interfered or detracted ________ Aided and abetted somewhat ________ Materially aided and abetted ________ Not applicable because state does not have a general coordinating agency ________ Not applicable because program is administered by separate agency ________ Other ________________________________

____

If you checked other than one of the "not applicable" options, give briefly the basis for your answer and be as specific as possible. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________________________

____

____

____

16. Describe briefly how the five-year plan and the annual program were evolved. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________________________

____

____

____

____

17. a. Has a professional consulting agency been engaged to assist with the development of the state plan or the administration of this program?
Yes ________ No ________
b. If "yes," what was the value of its contribution?
Material ________ Helpful ________ Little value ________

18. How many of the institutions of higher education in your state had an established technical service program in 1965?

________ state-supported institutions
________ non-state-supported institutions

19. Prior to development of the state plans required by this program, did the state have a general plan for the coordination of the state's educational efforts in the field of technical service? Yes ________ No ________ Not a specific plan as such, but a general understanding or agreement between the state institutions as to their respective roles or areas ________ Other ________________

____

Please comment: (Attach additional sheet if needed)

____

____

____

____

20. a. If there was some degree of coordination of the technical services programs of the state prior to the enactment of the Technical Services Act of 1965, what agency or institution of the state had the responsibility for this coordination? ________________________

____

There was no coordination ________ Coordination was voluntary ________

b. To what state official or agency was the agency named in "a" responsible? ________________________

____

Not applicable ________

21. How many of the institutions of higher education in your state are participants or have participated in the technical services programs encompassed by the state plans under this Federal Act?

________ state-supported institutions
________ non-state-supported institutions

22. Have the state plans for this program resulted in a greater degree of coordination of the technical services programs of the institutions of higher education? Yes ________ No ________ Other ________________________

____

Please comment: (Attach additional sheet if needed)

____

____

____

____

23. What has been the reaction of the state-supported institutions of higher education to the administration of this program under a state plan rather than each institution being able to negotiate directly with the Federal agency for support of its technical services programs? Only one institution involved ________ General approval ________ General disapproval ________ Some degree of doubt or apprehension ________ Approval generally but with one or more institutional exceptions ________ Other ________________________________

____

Give briefly the basis for your answer: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________________

____

____

____

24. What has been the reaction of non-state-supported institutions of higher education to the administration of this program under a state plan rather than each institution being able to negotiate directly with the Federal agency for support of its technical services programs? Non-state-supported institutions are not involved ________ General approval ________ General disapproval ________ Some degree of doubt or apprehension ________ Approval generally but with one or more institutional exceptions ________ Other ________________________

____

Give briefly the basis for your answer: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________________

____

____

25. Has any institution made formal protest of the state plan or any part thereof? Yes ________ No ________

26. If there has been formal protest, state briefly the nature of the protest and the result of the protest. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________________

____

____

____

____

____

A Research Project of the Southern Regional Education Board

A Study of the Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

Questionnaire F

To Be Answered by Agencies and Institutions Designated to Administer the State Technical Services Act of 1965

---

1. Name of State ______________________________

2. Name of state agency or institution administering Title I ______________________________
____

3. Name, title, and address of person completing report
____
____
____

4. Is this agency or institution charged with the general responsibility for governing or coordinating the state-supported institutions of higher education in the state? Yes ________ No ________

5. If your answer to Question 4 was "no," state briefly the reasons for designating an agency other than the coordinating agency to administer this Federal program. (Attach additional sheet if needed) Check here ______ if state does not have a coordinating agency. ________
____
____
____

6. To what state official or agency is the agency or institution named in Question 2 responsible as regards the administration of this Federal program? ________
____

7. If an agency, what is its composition? ________
____
____
____
____

8. a. What is the constituency of the official advisory committee for this program? ________
____
____
____
____

   b. How effective has this committee been in its advisory role? Quite effective ________ Somewhat effective ________ Minimally effective ________
   Comment: ______________________________
   ____
   ____

9. Has the agency or institution been provided with adequate staff to carry out its responsibilities in administering this program? Yes ________ No ________

10. The state agency or institution currently employs the equivalent of ________ administrative and ________ clerical full-time personnel to administer this program.

11. To what extent has the Federal allocation for administration of this Federal program paid the total cost of administration? Federal allocations for administration of the program have provided approximately ________ percent of the total cost of administration.

12. Has the level of Federal support for administration of this program been sufficient to permit the state agency or institution to carry out fully the responsibilities assigned to it under the program? Yes ________ No ________
Comment: ______________________________
____

13. If the agency or institution administering this program is other than the general coordinating agency (statutory or voluntary) for higher education, to what extent is there coordination between the agencies? None ________ Very little ________ Moderate ________ Extensive ________ Not applicable because state does not have a coordinating agency ________ Not applicable because coordinating agency administers program ________. If your answer indicates that some degree of coordination exists, describe briefly how this is implemented. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________
____
____
____

14. If this Federal program is administered by an agency or institution other than the state coordinating agency, what effect has this division of responsibility had on state planning and coordination of higher education? None ________ Adversely affected to some extent ________ Aided and abetted to some extent ________ Not applicable because state does not have a general coordinating agency ________ Not applicable because coordinating agency administers this program ________
Other ______________________________
____
Please comment: ______________________________
____
____

25. Has any institution made formal protest of the state plan or any part thereof? Yes ________ No ________

26. If there has been formal protest, state briefly the nature of the protest and the result of the protest. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________________________

____

____

____

27. Under the authority of Section 103(c), Higher Education Act of 1965, has your state "requested that a portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title? Yes ________ No ________ If "yes," what State ________________
If "yes," how have the programs of the two states been coordinated to assure that "the programs with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request?" ________________

____

____

____

28. If Title I is not now administered by the state coordinating agency, would it be desirable from the viewpoint of state planning and coordination of higher education for Title I to be administered by that agency? Yes ________ No ________ State does not have a state coordinating agency. ________ Other ________________

____

Your comments: ________________________

____

____

29. Has the existence of this Federal program increased state attention to the problems and the opportunities in the area of community service and continuing education? Yes ______ No ________ Other ________________

____

Comments: ________________________

____

____

____

30. Has there been any other general or specific impact of this Federal program which should be noted? Yes ________ No ________ If "yes," please explain. ____________

____

____

____

____

* * * *

Additional Comment:

state does not have a general coordinating agency .... Not applicable because coordinating agency administers this program .... Other ....

Please comment: ....

15. If Title I is administered by the state coordinating agency, what impact has administration of this program had on the planning and coordinating activities of that agency? None .... Interfered or detracted .... Aided and abetted somewhat .... Materially aided and abetted .... Not applicable because state does not have a general coordinating agency .... Not applicable because program is administered by separate agency .... Other ....

If you checked other than one of the "not applicable" options, give briefly the basis for your answer and be as specific as possible. (Attach additional sheet if needed)

16. Describe briefly how the state plan for Title I was evolved. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

17. a. Has a professional consulting agency been engaged to assist with the development of the state plan or the administration of Title I? Yes .... No ....

b. If "yes," what was the value of its contribution? Material .... Helpful .... Little value ....

18. How many of the institutions of higher education in your state had established programs of community service or continuing education in 1965?

.... state-supported institutions.

.... non-state-supported institutions.

19. Prior to development of the state plan required by Title I, did the state have a general plan for the coordination of the state's educational efforts in community service and continuing education? Yes .... No .... Not a specific plan as such, but a general understanding or agreement between the state institutions as to their respective roles or areas .... Other ....

Please comment: (Attach additional sheet if needed)

20. a. If there was some degree of coordination of the community service and continuing education programs of the state prior to the enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1965, what agency or institution of the state had the responsibility for this coordination?

There was no coordination .... Coordination was voluntary ....

b. To what state official or agency was the agency named in "a" responsible? ....

Not applicable ....

21. How many of the institutions of higher education in your state are participants or have participated, in the community service and continuing education programs encompassed by the state plan under Title I?

.... state-supported institutions.

.... non-state-supported institutions.

22. Has the state plan for Title I resulted in a greater degree of coordination of community service and continuing education programs of the institutions of higher education? Yes .... No .... Other ....

Please comment. (Attach additional sheet if needed)

23. What has been the reaction of the state-supported institutions of higher education to the administration of Title I under a state plan rather than each institution being able to negotiate directly with the Federal agency for support of its community service and continuing education programs? Only one institution involved .... General approval .... General disapproval .... Some degree of doubt or apprehension .... Approval generally but with one or more institutional exceptions .... Other ....

Give briefly the basis for your answer. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

24. What has been the reaction of non-state-supported institutions of higher education to the administration of Title I under a state plan rather than each institution being able to negotiate directly with the Federal agency for support of its community service and continuing education programs? Non-state-supported institutions are not involved .... General approval .... General disapproval .... Some degree of doubt or apprehension .... Approval generally but with one or more institutional exceptions .... Other ....

Give briefly the basis for your answer. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

A Research Project of the Southern Regional Education Board

A Study of the Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education

Questionnaire E

To Be Answered by Agencies and Institutions Designated to Administer the Higher Education Act of 1965 Title I-Community Service and Continuing Education Programs

---

1. Name of State ________
2. Name of state agency or institution administering Title I ________
____
3. Name, title, and address of person completing report
____
____
____
4. Is this agency or institution charged with the general responsibility for governing or coordinating the state-supported institutions of higher education in the state? Yes ______ No ______
5. If your answer to Question 4 was "no," state briefly the reasons for designating an agency other than the coordinating agency to administer this Federal program. (Attach additional sheet if needed) Check here ______ if state does not have a coordinating agency. ______
____
____
____
6. To what state official or agency is the agency or institution named in Question 2 responsible as regards the administration of Title I? ________
____
7. If an agency, what is its composition? ________
____
____
____
____
8. a. Has an advisory committee been appointed to advise the designated state agency or institution regarding the development of the required state plan and the administration of Title I? Yes ______ No ______
   b. If "yes," please indicate the constituency of the membership and the nature of the advisory committee's activities. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______
   ____
   ____
   ____
9. Has the agency or institution been provided with adequate staff to carry out its responsibilities in administering Title I? Yes ______ No ______
10. The state agency or institution currently employs the equivalent of ______ administrative and ______ clerical full-time personnel to administer Title I.
11. To what extent has the Federal allocation for administration of Title I paid the total cost of administration? Federal allocations for administration of Title I have provided approximately ______ percent of the total cost of administration.
12. Has the level of Federal support for administration of Title I been sufficient to permit the state agency or institution to carry out fully the responsibilities assigned to it under the program? Yes ______ No ______
Comment: ________
____
13. If the agency or institution administering Title I is other than the general coordinating agency (statutory or voluntary) for higher education, to what extent is there coordination between the agencies? None ______ Very little ______ Moderate ______ Extensive ______ Not applicable because state does not have a coordinating agency ______ Not applicable because coordinating agency administers Title I ______. If your answer indicates that some degree of coordination exists, describe briefly how this is implemented. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ________
____
____
____
14. If Title I is administered by an agency or institution other than the state coordinating agency, what effect has this division of responsibility had on state planning and coordination of higher education? None ______ Adversely affected to some extent ______ Aided and abetted to some extent ______ Not applicable because

22. What has been the reaction of the state-supported institutions of higher education to the administration of these Federal programs by a state agency under a state plan rather than direct negotiation by each institution with the Federal agency at all stages of its request?
General approval .... General disapproval ....
Some degree of doubt and apprehension .... Approved generally but with one or more institutional exceptions ....
Give briefly the basis for your answer: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

23. What has been the reaction of the non-state-supported institutions of higher education to the administration of these Federal programs by a state agency under a state plan rather than direct negotiation by each institution with the Federal agency at all stages of its request? General approval .... General disapproval .... Some degree of general doubt and apprehension .... Approval generally but with one or more institutional exceptions ....
Give briefly the basis for your answer: (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

24. Have any institutions appealed the priorities established for their grant requests under the state plans for these programs? Yes .... No .... Public Institutions .... Private Institutions ....
Both ....
If you answered "yes," indicate the nature of substance of the complaint and the result. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

25. Have any institutions objected to the criteria, or the weighting given, in the state plans developed for these programs?
Criteria: Yes .... No ....
Weighting: Yes .... No ....
Public Institutions .... Private Institutions ....
Both ....
If you checked a "yes" answer, indicate the nature or substance of the objection and the result. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

26. In the administration of Title I, have any of the Federal funds available for public community colleges and technical institutes under Section 103 been allocated to Section 104 type institutions?
Yes .... No ....
If "yes," to what extent? ....

Have any of the funds available for Section 104 type institutions been allocated to Section 103 institutions?
Yes .... No ....
If "yes," to what extent? ....

Has this flexibility in the Facilities Act enhanced state planning of academic facilities?
Yes .... No .... Please comment: ....

27. Has your state applied for planning funds under Section 105(b)(2), Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963? Yes .... No .... Plan to apply ....
If so, what amount has been requested? ....
Received? ....

28. Is the planning which is to be supported by these Section 105(b)(2) grant funds correlated with other planning activities for higher education in your state?
Yes .... No ....
Give the basis for your answer and indicate the different agencies or institutions involved. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ....

29. If these two Federal programs are not now administered by the state coordinating agency, would it be desirable from the viewpoint of state planning and coordination of higher education for these programs to be administered by that agency? Yes .... No ....
State does not have a state coordination agency ....
Other opinion ....
Your comments: ....

30. From the viewpoint of state planning and coordination would it be desirable for Title II—Graduate Facilities, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, to be administered under a state plan by the same state agency which administers Title I—Undergraduate Facilities?
Yes .... No .... Other opinion ....
Your comments: ....

31. From the viewpoint of state planning and coordination would it be desirable for Title III—Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to be correlated with the administration of Title I to permit the designated state agency to include loans as well as grants in its state plan, with authority to recommend priorities, either identical or different, for each of the two sources of funds? Yes .... No .... Other opinion ....
Your comments: ....

14. If these Federal programs are administered by the state coordinating agency, what impact has administration of these programs had on the coordinating activities of that agency? None ______ Interfered or detracted ______ Aided or abetted somewhat ______ Materially aided and abetted ______ Not applicable because state does not have a general coordinating agency ______ Not applicable because programs are administered by separate agency ______.
If you checked other than one of the last two options, give briefly the basis for your answer and be as specific as possible. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______

15. Describe briefly how the state plan for Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act was evolved. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______

16. Describe briefly how the state plan for Title VI A, Higher Education Act was evolved. (Attach additional sheet if needed) ______

17. a. Has an advisory committee been appointed to advise the designated state agency regarding the development of the required state plan and the administration of Title I? Yes ______ No ______

b. If "yes," please indicate the constituency of the membership and the nature of the committee's activities.

18. a. Has an advisory committee been appointed to advise the designated state agency regarding the development of the required state plan and the administration of Title VI A? Yes ______ No ______ Same as Title I ______

b. If "yes," please indicate the constituency of the membership and the nature of the committee's activities.

19. a. Has a professional consulting agency been engaged to assist with the development of the state plan or with the administration of the Federal program?

YES– Title I ______ NO– Title I ______
Title VI A ______ Title VI A ______

b. If a professional consulting agency has been employed, what was the value of its contribution? Material ______ Helpful ______ Little value ______

20. a. Prior to the development of the state plan required by Title I of the Facilities Act was there any type of a state plan to determine needs, priorities, etc., for construction of academic facilities at the state-supported institutions of higher education? Yes ______ No ______ Comment: ______

b. If not, has the administration of Title I brought about, or contributed to, the development of comprehensive facilities planning for the state institutions? Yes ______ No ______ Comment: ______

c. If there was facilities planning on a state basis involving determination of needs or establishing priorities prior to the Facilities Act, what state agency was responsible for developing and administering the facilities planning program?
Developed by ______
Administered by ______
Comments: ______

d. What effect has the state plan developed for Title I had on the previous facilities planning program of the state? Prior state plan incorporated into state plan for Title I ______ Prior state planning procedure determines institutional construction projects to be submitted under state plan for Title I grants ______ State plan for Title I provides a basis for coordinating facilities planning for state institutions which did not previously exist, or to an extent which did not previously exist ______. Either check one of the above or make your own assessment as follows: ______

Comment: ______

21. a. Is there an organization in the state of all, or substantially all, of the private institutions of higher education? Yes ______ No ______

b. If so, has this organization been involved in any material extent in an advisory capacity in the development or implementation of these Federal programs?

YES– Title I ______ NO– Title I ______
Title VI A ______ Title VI A ______

c. If an organization of private institutions has been involved as indicated by a "yes" answer in "b," what was the value of its contribution?
Contributed materially ______ Contributed somewhat ______ Was not involved ______ Has made more difficult ______